

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523  
BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY

Batch 67

1. SUBJECT  
CLASSI-  
FICATION

A. PRIMARY

B. SECONDARY

TEMPORARY

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Local urban community as an arena of political learning: Impact of residential context upon political attitudes and behavior among the migrant poor in Latin American cities

3. AUTHOR(S)

Cornelius, W.A.

4. DOCUMENT DATE

1972

5. NUMBER OF PAGES

70p.

6. ARC NUMBER

ARC

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

Harvard

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability)

9. ABSTRACT

(SOCIAL SCIENCES R&D)

10. CONTROL NUMBER

PN-AAE-204

11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT

12. DESCRIPTORS

13. PROJECT NUMBER

14. CONTRACT NUMBER  
CSD-2502 Res.

15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

PN-AAE-204  
AID/C.S.D.-2502  
ISD-H

THE LOCAL URBAN COMMUNITY AS AN ARENA OF POLITICAL LEARNING: THE IMPACT OF  
RESIDENTIAL CONTEXT UPON POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR AMONG  
THE MIGRANT POOR IN LATIN AMERICAN CITIES

by

Wayne A. Cornelius  
Department of Political Science  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Prepared for delivery at the 1972 Annual Meeting of the  
American Political Science Association, Washington Hilton  
Hotel, Washington, D.C., September 5-9. Copyright, 1972,  
The American Political Science Association.

THE LOCAL URBAN COMMUNITY AS AN ARENA OF POLITICAL LEARNING: THE IMPACT OF  
RESIDENTIAL CONTEXT UPON POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR AMONG  
THE MIGRANT POOR IN LATIN AMERICAN CITIES\*

Wayne A. Cornelius  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Most urban centers in contemporary Latin America and other regions of the developing world are now populated by large numbers of low-income migrants of rural origin, whose assimilation into the urban environment has recently become the object of intensive study by numerous investigators. Much of this work appears to be informed by a concern for the attitudinal and behavioral consequences of differential urban socialization, reflected in research designs involving comparative study of populations in several urban neighborhoods or settlement zones within single cities.<sup>1</sup> Such studies assume that (1) the impact of cityward migration and exposure to the urban environment upon attitudes and behavior is selective rather than uniform, and (2) that it is mediated importantly by contextual variables operating at the level of the urban residential zone. The results of these studies suggest that characteristics of the particular residential environments in which the migrant finds himself at various stages of the assimilation process may be of greater importance

---

\*This paper draws upon research supported at various points during the past five years by the Foreign Area Fellowship Program, The Danforth Foundation, The National Science Foundation, the Center for Research in International Studies at Stanford University, and the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University. Financial assistance from all these sources is gratefully acknowledged. Research is continuing, under a grant provided by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations' Program of Social Science and Legal Research on Population Policy, as part of a cross-national study of politicization and demand-making behavior among low-income migrants to large cities. For a description of this broader project see Cornelius, Dietz, and White (1972). Portions of the present paper will appear in revised and condensed form in Cornelius (1972c). The author is much indebted to Manuel V. Cisneros, Kathleen Foote, and Veronica Stoddart for research assistance and to Professor Richard Fagen for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Special thanks are due to Ann L. Craig for technical and editorial assistance in the production of this paper. Responsibility for any remaining inaccuracies and shortcomings rests, of course, with the author.

as determinants of political attitudes and behavior in the urban setting than the personal attributes of migrants or internal characterological changes stimulated by the experience of migration.

Despite increased concern with the role that residence in particular urban subcommunities plays in the socialization of low-income migrants to the city, there has been little investigation of the ways in which community of residence comes to influence political attitudes and behavior. If residential context does appear to have a significant impact upon political learning among in-migrant populations, how does this "neighborhood effect" operate? A number of specific research questions are suggested: What kinds of socialization experiences, social interaction networks, and structural factors generate and maintain attitudinal and behavioral norms in specific communities? What are the underlying psychological and social psychological processes through which such norms are internalized by the residents? What are the individual characteristics and predispositions which determine whether or not (or to what extent) people are susceptible to the influence of their residential context? Finally, what characteristics of local urban communities affect the salience of residential context in the political socialization of the migrant poor? These are the principal questions to which the present study is addressed. As one student of low-income groups in U.S. cities has argued, "If the neighborhood concept is to have utility in sociology, it is essential to gain a better understanding of the function of these local areas in the generation and maintenance of norms and attitudes." (Wilson, 1971a: 369). It is our purpose here to contribute to such an understanding with respect to the kinds of communities which have served as primary receiving areas for migrants from the countryside in Latin America in recent decades.

#### The Low-Income Urban Community in Latin America

Urban sociology in the United States has often emphasized the residential differentiation of the city into a "mosaic of social worlds," representing territorially-based, ongoing social subsystems.<sup>2</sup> Recent concern over the social consequences of urban renewal, community control of schools and municipal services, and the problems of maximizing citizen participation in governmental programs at the local level have refocused

attention upon the low-income urban neighborhood as a social and political community.<sup>3</sup> In developing countries the emergence of hundreds of new "uncontrolled" settlements formed through squatter invasions on the periphery of the largest cities has led to increased recognition of the local urban community as a crucial arena for social and political interaction. (see Turner, 1971; Juppenlatz, 1970; Leeds, 1969; Mangin, 1967).

Studies of these and other types of low-income settlement zones, as well as working-class areas of cities in the United States and England (Barresi and Lindquist, 1970; Fried and Gleicher, 1970; Gans, 1962; Suttles, 1968), provide abundant evidence that such communities represent far more than mere statistical aggregates or ecological collectivities of urban dwellers. They are frequently regarded by large proportions of their inhabitants as an identifiable segment of urban space. In research on low-income migrants to Mexico City, for example, it was found that 88% of those surveyed could draw a map of their community of residence which corresponded to the legally or informally recognized boundaries of the community (Cornelius, 1972b; Cf. Peattie, 1968: 54-55; Ross, 1970). The high density of population in such areas, together with utilization of communal facilities and the existence of acute service deprivation and other community-related problems which must be addressed through collective action insure a high incidence of face-to-face or "primary" relations among the residents. Low-income communities in Latin American cities often exhibit a high level of community consciousness and a tendency of individuals to identify their own future with that of the community. In communities characterized by relatively high stability of residence, there may be a substantial accumulation of common shared experience. Some communities, particularly squatter settlements, possess distinctive normative systems which appear to provide important attitudinal and behavioral cues for residents in their relations with neighbors, as well as a kind of cognitive map useful for ordering perceptions of the larger urban environment. These locally-based normative systems may be the product of the community's interaction with the larger social and political systems of the city in which it is located, or may result from internal social processes.

Comparative studies of local communities within Latin American cities have revealed distinctive neighborhood patterns with respect to a wide range of attitudes, behaviors, and value orientations. Even geographically contiguous communities have been found to differ sharply in the extent and manner in which their inhabitants are integrated socially, economically, and politically into urban life.<sup>4</sup> We shall use data gathered in six low-income communities (colonias proletarias) located on the periphery of the Mexico City metropolitan area to illustrate the importance of such within-city differentiation. Three of these communities (Colonias Nueva, Del Río, and Militar) are squatter settlements formed by illegal occupation of privately or publicly owned land. Another community (Colonia Texcoco) originated as a low-income subdivision created by a commercial land developer. Another (San Gabriel) was created by the government as a low-income housing project, as was the final community included in the study (Colonia Perdida), a resettlement area formed as a consequence of mass relocation of families from central-city slums eradicated by the government. The communities chosen for inclusion in the study were selected purposively so as to maximize the range of variation among them on certain theoretically relevant dimensions, principally type of origin and access to public services. The six settlements were also intended to be representative of the full range of principal types of urban residential environments which have served as receiving areas for migrants to the city.<sup>5</sup>

The data reported in Tables 1 through 5 reveal marked differences among residents of the six communities in terms of a wide range of perceptual, attitudinal, and socio-psychological variables. Differences in orientations toward the community and the political system are most striking, but wide variations also appear with reference to perceptions of self and non-local environment and the socio-psychological characteristics of the residents. Statistically significant differences among the communities on these dimensions persist when the age, socioeconomic status, and length of urban residence of individual residents are held constant. Some comparisons between two of the communities are illustrative. Residents of the most recently established squatter settlement (Colonia Nueva) are conspicuous for their high perception of external threats to individual and community values, their strong disposition to work collectively in problem-solving and need satisfaction, a very low tolerance for dissent

TABLE 1. PERCEPTIONS OF SELF AND ENVIRONMENT AMONG MIGRANTS, BY COMMUNITY OF RESIDENCE\*

Index	Community						Sig.**
	Nueva (N=130)	Del Río (N=101)	Texcoco (N=124)	Perdida (N=131)	San Gabriel (N=77)	Militar (N=116)	
(High)							
Overall life satisfaction .....	37.1%	61.0%	27.3%	39.9%	49.2%	48.1%	(p<.0001)
Satisfaction with urban environment .....	51.3	63.6	39.4	59.9	39.0	51.3	(p<.0006)
Perception of external threat .....	64.6	46.8	30.5	11.6	3.4	17.8	(p<.0001)
Sense of individual progress (mobility) .....	81.2	74.8	65.9	69.1	67.8	78.8	(p<.0359)
Sense of relative deprivation .....	58.4	54.0	64.3	54.9	35.6	64.4	(p<.0012)
Perception of social inequality .....	56.6	52.6	64.3	39.1	43.1	59.4	(p<.0005)
Sense of openness in society .....	28.8	61.0	23.7	45.9	61.0	59.2	(p<.0001)
Aspirations for children's mobility .....	64.2	44.2	52.2	43.4	66.1	77.7	(p<.0001)

\*Percentages reported in Tables 1 through 6 represent the proportions of migrant respondents having high scores on each index (e.g., in Colonia Nueva, 37.1% of the respondents were characterized by a high level of overall life satisfaction). Index scores were dichotomized into low and high categories with the cutting point located as close as possible to the total sample median. Questionnaire items used in constructing each index are reported in Appendix II; index construction procedures are described in Appendix I.

\*\*Significance level of the Chi-square statistic computed on a 12-cell table (d.f.=5).

TABLE 2. SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANTS, BY COMMUNITY OF RESIDENCE

<u>Index</u>	Community						Sig.
	Nueva (N=130)	Del Río (N=101)	Texcoco (N=124)	Perdida (N=131)	S.Gabriel (N=77)	Militar (N=116)	
(High)							
Disposition to work collectively .....	38.5%	59.2%	44.6%	42.5%	35.6%	35.4%	(p<.0001)
Trust in people .....	46.3	19.7	10.8	51.8	8.5	11.1	(p<.0001)
Tolerance for dissent and opposition .....	39.7	69.6	41.8	52.5	45.8	66.1	(p<.0001)
Protest orientation .....	36.4	58.9	40.5	20.7	32.2	40.5	(p<.0001)
Pessimism .....	21.2	16.1	28.1	10.9	11.9	15.1	(p<.0045)

TABLE 3. PERCEPTIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF COMMUNITY OF RESIDENCE AMONG MIGRANTS, BY COMMUNITY

Index	Community						Sig.
	Nueva (N=130)	Del Río (N=101)	Texcoco (N=124)	Perdida (N=131)	S.Gabriel (N=77)	Militar (N=116)	
(High)							
Knowledge of community .....	86.2%	59.4%	29.7%	46.0%	11.9%	30.3%	(p<.0001)
Psychological integration into community .....	75.4	39.8	31.7	37.5	36.2	25.5	(p<.0001)
Overall social integration into community .....	51.8	48.9	10.3	40.1	33.9	55.1	(p<.0001)
Perception of high community solidarity .....	100.0	92.1	84.3	89.2	76.3	74.4	(p<.0001)
Positive evaluation of social relations .....	89.8	56.0	58.6	70.0	62.7	66.7	(p<.0001)
Sense of community progress .....	67.9	80.0	72.3	94.2	71.2	77.0	(p<.0001)
Overall community affect .....	72.2	54.1	19.3	50.8	32.2	44.6	(p<.0001)
Positive evaluation of community leadership ...	91.4	76.0	34.5	51.6	33.9	49.7	(p<.0001)
Satisfaction with residential environment .....	50.8	68.1	13.7	50.8	44.1	64.3	(p<.0001)
Disposition to conform to community norms .....	76.1	64.2	47.8	56.7	42.4	36.6	(p<.0001)
Number of community problems perceived .....	76.9	49.2	85.1	62.5	37.3	38.0	(p<.0001)
Sense of insecurity of land tenure .....	47.2	69.7	21.5	10.2	7.7	15.6	(p<.0001)

TABLE 4. AFFECTIVE AND EVALUATIVE ORIENTATIONS TOWARD THE POLITICAL SYSTEM AMONG MIGRANTS,  
BY COMMUNITY OF RESIDENCE

Index	Community						Sig.
	Nueva (N=130)	Del Río (N=101)	Texcoco (N=124)	Perdida (N=131)	S.Gabriel (N=77)	Militar (N=116)	
(High)							
Political system affect .....	45.3%	27.1%	19.2%	71.7%	33.9%	49.9%	(p<.0001)
Political cynicism .....	40.4	70.2	59.4	30.0	72.9	61.0	(p<.0001)
Trust in government .....	66.1	35.3	27.3	75.1	67.8	55.8	(p<.0001)
Satisfaction with governmental outputs .....	42.1	63.2	18.9	59.2	91.5	82.9	(p<.0001)
Positive evaluation of political authorities ..	74.8	36.6	3.6	82.2	45.8	55.0	(p<.0001)
Perception of governmental concern for poor ...	40.0	50.0	6.4	43.2	49.2	37.0	(p<.0001)
Expectations for future government performance	50.7	46.3	28.1	78.3	47.5	58.1	(p<.0001)
Overall political system support .....	56.3	38.7	7.6	75.4	72.9	65.9	(p<.0001)
Support for official party (P.R.I.) .....	94.0	89.8	87.1	98.4	86.4	89.8	(p<.0098)
Pro- socio-political change orientation .....	19.6	22.6	36.1	15.0	25.4	33.9	(p<.0005)

TABLE 5. ORIENTATIONS TOWARD POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AMONG MIGRANTS, BY COMMUNITY OF RESIDENCE

<u>Index</u>	Community						Sig.
	Nueva (N=130)	Del Río (N=101)	Texcoco (N=124)	Perdida (N=131)	S.Gabriel (N=77)	Militar (N=116)	
(High)							
Civic mindedness .....	47.3%	30.3%	24.9%	22.5%	18.6%	17.0%	(p<.0001)
Self-help orientation .....	67.6	50.0	35.7	35.0	15.3	35.4	(p<.0001)
Perceived dependency on government .....	28.5	29.2	51.8	34.1	37.3	46.4	(p<.0004)
Subjective political competence .....	45.6	37.6	31.7	61.1	47.5	44.7	(p<.0002)

and opposition, and high levels of social trust and socio-psychological integration into the community. They are highly knowledgeable about community affairs and are strongly positive in their orientations toward the community and its leadership. Residents of this settlement also exhibit generally positive orientations toward the local and national political systems as well as a set of orientations supportive of politically participant behavior. They are highly civic-minded, perceive themselves to be politically competent, advocate community self-help efforts, and perceive themselves to be less dependent upon the government for improvements in the quality of their dwelling environment. By contrast, residents of the low-income commercial subdivision (Texcoco) exhibit low perception of external threat, a weak disposition to work collectively, and low levels of interpersonal trust and integration into the community. They are much less knowledgeable about their community and their evaluative orientations toward it are generally unfavorable. Colonia Texcoco residents evaluate the political system quite negatively and their expectations for future governmental performance are very low. Yet they perceive themselves to be dependent primarily upon the government for community improvements and exhibit low levels of civic-mindedness and subjective political competence.

These attitudinal differences can be explained largely in terms of the conditions under which the communities were formed, differential access to basic urban services, characteristics of community leadership structure, and specific events in the political history of the communities. Such factors are also relevant to an explanation of patterns of political behavior among residents of low-income urban communities. Findings from the Mexico City study reveal some rather striking differences in levels and modes of political involvement among migrants resident in the six research communities. The data reported in Table 6 indicate that overall rates of participation are highest in the two most recently established squatter communities (Colonia Nueva and Colonia del Río), and lowest in the commercial subdivision (Texcoco) and the public housing project (San Gabriel). Cross-community variations in electoral participation (voting and campaign involvement) are much less pronounced, as are differences in frequency of discussion of politics and individually-initiated contacting of public officials with regard to personal or family problems. High levels of communal political participation (activity in which the

TABLE 6. POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT AMONG MIGRANTS, BY COMMUNITY OF RESIDENCE

Index	Community						Sig.
	Nueva (N=130)	Del Río (N=101)	Texcoco (N=124)	Perdida (N=131)	S.Gabriel (N=77)	Militar (N=116)	
(I. Cognitive Involvement)							
(High)							
Overall political awareness .....	51.0%	31.0%	36.1%	54.2%	45.8%	46.4%	(p<.0026)
Perception of relevance of government and politics to need satisfaction .....	47.8	30.6	34.5	74.1	62.7	57.3	(p<.0001)
Political opinion-holding .....	17.5	20.8	20.1	16.1	37.3	29.5	(p<.0025)
Political knowledge .....	62.4	39.2	13.2	38.6	32.2	42.1	(p<.0001)
Perception of governmental outputs .....	13.9	8.4	22.9	90.9	44.1	50.6	(p<.0001)
(II. Behavioral Involvement)							
Overall political participation .....	79.8	57.0	37.7	49.2	27.1	43.6	(p<.0001)
Voting participation .....	62.9	71.0	60.6	64.7	72.9	70.8	(p<.2909)
Campaign involvement .....	34.4	30.0	25.3	34.3	11.9	24.4	(p<.0053)
Particularistic contacting of officials .....	11.9	1.8	8.0	13.4	10.2	14.3	(p<.0306)
Communal contacting of officials .....	43.9	23.4	6.2	20.9	13.6	22.6	(p<.0001)
Participation in community self-help-oriented problem-solving activity .....	95.7	75.7	53.3	37.5	30.5	41.9	(p<.0001)
Membership in politically-relevant organizations.....	63.7	24.5	9.2	62.5	15.3	41.4	(p<.0001)
Frequency of discussion of politics .....	34.7	36.8	45.8	33.3	45.8	51.6	(p<.0208)
Number of political activities beyond voting ..	75.2	64.4	39.3	53.4	25.4	45.4	(p<.0001)
Number of difficult political activities .....	46.6	35.5	21.3	36.8	13.6	26.9	(p<.0001)

individual works with other residents to deal with the problems of his community through internal self-help efforts, collectively-initiated contacting of public officials with regard to community needs and problems, and participation in politically relevant community organizations are most characteristic of the three squatter settlements (Colonias Nueva, del Río, and Militar). The two most recently established settlements (Nueva and del Río) also exhibit the widest range of political activities engaged in by community residents, as well as the highest incidence of participation in "difficult" political activities, defined here as those activities engaged in by fewer than 20% of the respondents in the total sample.

Patterns of cognitive political involvement are more complex. The highest perception of the relevance of government and politics to need satisfaction as well as the highest perception of governmental outputs are encountered in the government-initiated settlement inhabited by relocated slum dwellers (Colonia Perdida). Highest levels of political knowledge are found in the three squatter settlements (Nueva, del Río, and Militar). In general the lowest levels of cognitive involvement in the political process are exhibited by residents of the commercial subdivision, Colonia San Gabriel. Its residents appear to be so disillusioned with the performance of the government and so pessimistic about the prospects for receiving governmental assistance in the development of their community that they have opted out of all forms of political involvement.

These findings are reinforced by the results of an analysis in which migrants are classified according to the mode of political participation in which they more frequently engage. As reported in Table 7, the highest proportions of completely inactive, politically non-participant respondents are encountered in the commercial subdivision and the oldest of the three squatter settlements (Colonia Militar), whose residents now possess legal title to the land and access to a full complement of urban services and improvements. Migrants involved primarily in self-help activities within the community ("community problem-solvers") and in communal contacting of public officials are clustered in the two most recently established squatter settlements (Colonia Nueva and Colonia del Río). Respondents whose political activity is confined primarily to voting predominate in the public housing project (San Gabriel). There also are significant variations within other modes of political participation across communities.

TABLE 7. TYPES OF POLITICAL PARTICIPANTS AMONG MIGRANTS, BY COMMUNITY OF RESIDENCE

Participant Type*	Community					
	Nueva (N=62)	Del Río (N=68)	Texcoco (N=97)	Perdida (N=98)	S.Gabriel (N=66)	Militar (N=88)
Complete non-participant .....	0.0%	12.3%	19.0%	14.4%	7.8%	25.0%
Voting specialist .....	6.9	18.4	31.3	32.2	51.0	38.2
Campaigner .....	0.0	5.5	7.2	15.6	11.8	4.6
Community problem-solver .....	65.3	50.1	33.3	15.5	17.6	17.8
Particularistic contacter .....	0.0	0.0	1.0	11.1	3.9	1.1
Communal contacter.....	16.0	13.7	2.6	5.5	5.9	6.6
Complete activist .....	11.8	0.0	5.6	5.6	2.0	6.6

\*For purposes of this analysis we define as "complete non-participants" those respondents who rank below the total sample median on all five dimensions of political participation specified in this paper (voting, campaign involvement, participation in self-help-oriented community problem-solving activity, particularistic contacting of public officials, and communal contacting of officials). "Voting specialists" are those who score below the median on all indexes of participation except that of voting. We have found that, except among those respondents who are completely inactive in a political sense, a relatively high level of voter participation is characteristic of the migrant sample as a whole. Thus in attempting to identify respondents who tend to "specialize" in some mode of political participation besides voting, we shall operationalize such specialization in terms of high activism on one particular dimension of participation in addition to voting. Thus respondents whose political activity is confined largely to the community problem-solving mode are defined as those who score above the median on our indexes of voting and participation in community problem-solving activity but below the median on all other indexes of participation. Those who specialize in campaign involvement rank high on that index and the index of voting participation and low on all others. Respondents who are most likely to be active within the particularistic contacting mode score above the median on that index together with voting participation, but have low scores on our indexes of community problem-solving activity, campaign involvement, and communal contacting of officials. Specialists in communal contacting are those ranking high on the voting and communal contacting indexes and low on all others. The complete activists in our sample do not specialize in any particular type of political participation but score highly on all five indexes of participation. Respondents who could not be classified according to any of the modes of participation differentiated here--about 29% of the total sample of migrants--have been omitted from Table 7.

This analysis approximates in highly simplified form the identification of types of political participators carried out by Verba and Nie using cluster analysis techniques (see Verba and Nie, 1972: chap. 5).

Cross-community differences in the frequency distribution of various types of participants reported in Table 7 are statistically significant, by Chi-square test, at the .0001 level.

The above findings, together with those of other recent field studies conducted in Latin American cities, suggest that the immediate residential environment is an important source of variance in individual attitudes and behavior among migrants to the city and has a strong impact upon the process of politicization among such populations.<sup>6</sup> The reasons for this may be discerned more clearly through an examination of the functioning of the local urban community as an agent of political socialization.

#### The Local Urban Community as an Agent of Political Socialization

Many low-income urban communities in Latin American cities appear to fit the conventional sociological definition of a primary group, conceived as a group characterized by face-to-face, relatively intimate social relationships among its members, whose activities bear directly upon the socialization and development of the individual (Cf. Cooley, 1962: 23-31; Mann, 1970: 571; Timms, 1971: 9). While urban sociologists have long recognized the importance of neighborhood socialization for the learning of a wide range of social behaviors there has been relatively little appreciation of its relevance to processes of political learning.<sup>7</sup> This is particularly true with respect to the political socialization of migrants, who constitute a majority of the population in many low-income urban communities in Latin America.

Among such populations, the local community may achieve a heightened impact as an agent of political socialization due to the minimum exposure of migrants to other socializing agents, as well as the absence or weakness of other potential bases for political organization and mobilization.<sup>8</sup> Large proportions of the migrant population are not employed in large-scale enterprises, or even in small factories, offices, shops and other kinds of stable, structured work environments involving non-superficial relationships with co-workers or supervisors. In most cities only a small minority of the migrant population is organized in unions.<sup>9</sup> Nor are migrants likely to be members of political parties or other types of politically-relevant voluntary organizations beyond the local urban community level. City-wide groups or movements based on class, ethnic, regional or religious interests are relatively rare in Latin American urban areas and attract only numerically insignificant proportions of the migrant population. People who

migrate at an early point in the life cycle are exposed to the socialization influences of the family and the school after arrival in the city; but for those who migrate in late adolescence, early adulthood, or some later stage in the life cycle, the impact of these socialization agents is minimal. Exposure to the mass media of communication may be high in urban centers, but most studies have shown that frequent attention to the political content of such communication is relatively low. Thus for perhaps a majority of migrants, the local urban community represents their most important arena for political learning.

Beyond the behavioral and attitudinal norms for political activity which the community may provide for its residents, local living conditions and land tenure situations help to define the set of needs and problems perceived as salient by the residents. Community leaders and improvement associations often exercise an extremely important role in structuring opportunities for participation in politically relevant activities, as well as in filtering individual perceptions of the political system and its relevance to the satisfaction of personal and community needs.<sup>10</sup>

Moreover, it is often in the context of the interaction of the local community with political and governmental agencies that some of the most important political learning experiences of its residents are obtained. A great deal of collective bargaining and negotiation, often extending over a period of many years, goes into securing official recognition of land occupation rights and a full complement of urban services and improvements for such communities. The outcomes of community-related political demand-making efforts appear to be important determinants not only of levels and types of political participation but of a variety of evaluative orientations toward local and national governments.

The importance of the immediate residential environment in shaping political attitudes and behavior among cityward migrants can be illustrated briefly by reference to the styles and objects of political demand-making engaged in by such people. In the six-community study of migrants to Mexico City (Cornelius, 1972b) it was found that migrants are more likely to engage in demand-making aimed at satisfying some collective need or problem affecting all members of their community of residence than at satisfying some more particularistic need affecting only the individual or family

members. This predisposition toward demand-making activity with a collective referent can be explained largely by the fact that there is organizational support for such activity, usually provided by community improvement associations. This organizational support, as well as knowledge of and access to governmental decision-making processes provided by community leaders, are not usually available to individual residents attempting to extract particularistic rewards from the political system.

Migrant concentration on demand-making activity aimed at securing collective goods has important implications, because once needs for solution of basic community problems such as insecurity of land tenure or lack of water and sewage systems are satisfied, there is little inclination to engage in demand-making activity with a particularistic referent; and the organizational structure which has been created to negotiate with public agencies for solutions to community problems tends to atrophy or disintegrate within a very short period of time (Cf. Butterworth, 1971: 30; Cornelius, 1972b; Dietz, 1972; Goldrich, 1970a; Lutz, 1970: 122). Thus the lowest levels of demand-making activity, as well as other forms of political participation, are often encountered in those communities which have achieved the highest security of land tenure and the highest levels of service provision and infrastructural development. There appears to be little or no spill-over of demand-making activity aimed at community problems into other issue areas of broader social and economic import, such as provision of educational or occupational opportunities (Cf. Cornelius, 1973; Goldrich, 1970b: 189, 192).

The migrant's community of residence is often the locus of collective politicizing experiences which have a very important influence not only upon the modes of political participation in which he may engage but upon his overall frequency of participation. Among migrants to the Mexico City metropolitan area, for example, it was found that one of the most powerful predictors of frequency of political participation is a general disposition to work collectively, i.e., a generalized preference for collectively rather than individually pursued solutions to salient personal and community-related problems (Cornelius, 1973). Studies of low-income settlement residents in Santiago, Chile and Lima, Peru have also found a significant relationship between high politicization and a collective orientation toward problem-solving (Goldrich, 1970b: 189-191).

How does this crucially important orientation develop among the migrant poor? The absence of such an orientation, coupled with low levels of interpersonal trust, is frequently cited in studies of rural communities in Latin America to help explain low levels of political participation among peasants (see, for example, Fromm and Maccoby, 1970: 206-210). Moreover, it is an orientation which seems to be developed over time in the city, i.e., migrants with longer urban residence are significantly more likely to exhibit a disposition to work collectively than the more recently-arrived. Thus it is largely a product of urban socialization experiences such as land invasions, community confrontations and negotiations with public officials, community self-help projects, and other types of community-related experiences. Exposure to such experiences appears to be necessary for development of a strong collective orientation toward problem-solving. Collective politicizing experiences also figure importantly in the development of a high level of community solidarity and a generalized disposition to conform to community norms.<sup>11</sup>

The complex way in which the community context conditions migrant attitudes toward the political system can be illustrated by reference to another finding from the Mexico City study. It was discovered that the best predictor of overall level of support for the political system among migrants was access to basic urban services and improvements such as water and sewage systems, electricity, and paved streets (Cornelius, 1972b). These are collective goods allocated differentially to communities or settlement zones within the city in which individual migrants have shared (or failed to share) by virtue of their residence in specific communities. Moreover, the impact of access to public services upon levels of political system support and environmental satisfaction may be mediated by individual perceptions of the rate of community progress and prospects for future improvements. Thus the same absolute level of service deprivation may give rise to significantly varying configurations of political attitudes in different communities, depending upon the extent to which residents perceive their community to be upwardly mobile in a developmental sense and likely to be the recipient of future governmental benefits (Cf. Collier, 1971: 123-124; Portes, 1971a: 237-239). These perceptions, in turn, may be strongly influenced by community leadership and the history of community relationships with political and governmental agencies.

The Analysis of Community Contextual Effects

The community context may have the effect of either strengthening or weakening individual attitudes and behavioral predispositions toward politics. The way in which this "community effect" operates and the conditions under which it is most likely to exert an important influence on political behavior may be explored through a form of analysis which has been employed widely in the sociological literature concerned with relationships between individual and group-level properties. Relationships between the attitudes and behavior of individuals and the characteristics of social collectivities to which they belong have been a major concern of sociological inquiry dating back at least to the work of Durkheim on anomie and social integration.<sup>12</sup>

Paul Lazarsfeld coined the term "contextual analysis" to designate a type of simultaneous, multi-level analysis which attempts to explain the behavior of an individual in terms of the social context or milieu to which he is exposed, when certain of his own personal attributes are held constant.<sup>13</sup> A contextual approach to the analysis of sample survey data enables the investigator to overcome important limitations of conventional survey studies, which tend to make isolated individuals the focus of analysis and largely ignore the socio-political setting in which individual attitudes and behavior occur.<sup>14</sup>

The theoretical assumptions underlying this approach can be stated quite simply: "Individual behavior is influenced not only by individual characteristics but by the social context of the individual, both as it is perceived by the individual and as an objective situation influencing the possibilities of action." Moreover, "the behavior of an individual is influenced by the proportion of people in his environment who are engaged in that form of behavior" (Barton, 1968: 8; 1970: 220-221).<sup>15</sup> With reference to political behavior, it could be argued that a social unit characterized by a high frequency of political participation among its members provides a context that directly stimulates participation and that can be perceived by the individual member as sanctioning such behavior. Thus persons possessing the same set of individual attributes may participate politically in significantly different ways, depending upon the proportion of those within their immediate social environment

who are politically active or who share some perception or attitudinal orientation relevant to political activity.

Studies of contextual effects operating at the level of the local urban community in the United States and England have documented significant relationships between community characteristics and individual attitudes toward education (Robson, 1969: 216-234), social mobility orientations (Blalock, 1967), anomia (Orbell, 1970; Wilson, 1971a, 1971b), racial attitudes (Orbell and Sherrill, 1969), mental disorder and deviant behavior (Timms, 1971: 14-31), propensity to help others in situations of collective stress (Barton, 1970: 214ff), organizational participation (Bell and Force, 1956), and other types of social participation (Bell, 1965; Greer, 1956). Students of political behavior in the United States have frequently been concerned with the effects of local political context upon voting behavior and partisanship, demonstrating in a number of studies that when individual characteristics are held constant, people will tend to vote for the party supported by the climate of opinion in the communities in which they live.<sup>16</sup>

In the contextual analysis which follows, based on data gathered for our study of low-income migrants to Mexico City (Cornelius, 1972b), we shall focus upon the variable of overall political participation, including voting, campaign involvement, individual and communal contacting of public officials, and participation in community self-help problem solving activity. The partial correlation approach which we shall use for this analysis entails controlling the effects of individual socio-demographic attributes and orientations toward political participation while measuring the relationship between selected participant characteristics of the community of residence (independent variable) and individual political participation (dependent variable). Community of residence is characterized in terms of the actual percentage of residents who rank above the total sample median on our indexes of overall political participation, civic-mindedness, disposition to conform to community norms, perception of external threat, and self-help orientation.<sup>17</sup>

The data reported in Table 8 are strongly indicative of a significant contextual effect. The overall frequency of political participation in a community, as well as the frequency distribution of certain kinds of

TABLE 8. ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY CONTEXTUAL EFFECTS AMONG MIGRANTS

I. Correlations of Selected Contextual Variables with Individual Political Participation

<u>Independent Variable</u>	<u>Dependent Variable</u>	<u>Control Variables</u>	$r_1^*$	$r_2^{**}$
Level of overall political participation in community of residence	Individual political participation	Age, socioeconomic status, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics	.317	.396
Degree of civic mindedness in community of residence	Individual political participation	Age, SES, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics, civic mindedness of respondent	.301	.355
General disposition to conform to community norms in community of residence	Individual political participation	Age, SES, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics, respondent's disposition to conform to community norms	.244	.295
Perception of external threat in community of residence	Individual political participation	Age, SES, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics, respondent's perception of external threat	.279	.267
Strength of self-help orientation in community of residence	Individual political participation	Age, SES, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics, respondent's self-help orientation	.284	.262

(CONTINUATION OF TABLE ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

TABLE 8 (Continued)

II. Multiple Regression of Individual and Contextual Variables upon Overall Political Participation Index

<u>Variables in the Equation</u>	<u>Multiple Correlation</u>	<u>% of Variance Explained</u>
Age, socioeconomic status, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics	.445	19.8
Age, socioeconomic status, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics, level of overall political participation in community of residence, degree of civic mindedness in community of residence, general disposition to conform to community norms in community of residence, perception of external threat in community of residence, strength of self-help orientation in community of residence	.562	31.6

\* $r_1$  represents the simple (zero-order) correlation of the contextual variable with individual political participation.

\*\* $r_2$  represents the fifth-order partial correlation of the contextual variable with individual political participation, controlling for the effects of various individual characteristics.

(Correlations are based on an N of 670, and all coefficients reported are significant at the .001 level or beyond.)

attitudes (high civic-mindedness, disposition to conform to community norms, perception of external threat, and self-help orientation) exert an independent influence upon political participation levels among community residents. The relationships between individual level of political participation and the participant characteristics of the community of residence remain strong, and in some cases increase in strength, after the various personal attributes of the residents are held constant.

The addition of the five community contextual variables to a multiple regression equation results in an absolute increase of 12% in the explained variance in political participation beyond the effects of age, socioeconomic status, length of urban residence, and psychological involvement in politics. Given the fact that the latter individual characteristics alone account for only about 20% of the variance in level of political participation, the contribution to explained variance made by community contextual variables is an important one.

Short of a laboratory study in which experimental groups are constructed according to randomization procedures, causal interpretations of any kind of contextual effect must necessarily suffer from some degree of indeterminacy. One potential source of such indeterminacy is what Ulf Himmelstrand has referred to as "homopolitical selectivity," defined as the tendency for like individuals consciously to seek each other out for formal and informal interaction (Himmelstrand, 1960: 399-408; Cf. Cox, 1969: 164ff). The manner in which members are selected into groups may influence the relationship between individual and group characteristics and may create in this way a spurious contextual effect (Cf. Tannenbaum and Bachman, 1964: 593). At issue here is the question of whether the individual living in a community comes to reflect the attitudinal or behavioral patterns of that community, or whether he has moved there because of the similarity of its attitudinal and behavioral norms to his own. Gans, for example, has argued that changes in the social behavior of newcomers to suburban neighborhoods in U.S. cities had their origins in the residents' motivations for moving into such communities and were not the result of socialization within the new residential environment (Gans, 1961a, 1961b; Wilson, 1971b: 77).

While it is impossible to dismiss entirely the applicability of this selective migration hypothesis to the populations under study in this

paper, its plausibility is reduced by a number of factors. Among them is the generally low level of political interest and awareness characteristic of low-income migrants to Latin American cities. It seems most unlikely that migrants' perceptions of the political character of an urban settlement zone constitute an important criterion for the selection of a particular community of residence. Participant observation and survey interviews in the communities included in the Mexico City study provide much evidence that residents of these areas usually became neighbors by a fairly random process; and the survey results clearly suggest that decisions to move to a particular community were based primarily upon considerations of material well-being and convenience. The most frequently mentioned reasons for choosing one's current community of residence, as well as previous places of residence within the city, were economic attraction (low rents, the opportunity to occupy rent-free housing, low land prices, etc.), proximity to job or sources of employment, home-ownership or land-ownership opportunities afforded by the area, and the presence of relatives or friends already living there. Respondents were also asked to specify the most important things that they would consider in choosing another place of residence, if they should choose to make such a move at some point in the future. In this case, the most frequently cited criteria of selection were access to public services, proximity to job or the central city, the cost of land or housing, and opportunities for home or land ownership.<sup>18</sup> Such evidence suggests that the selection processes operative in forming the kinds of communities under study here are largely irrelevant to the particular variables under consideration. Therefore the contextual effects we have identified cannot be attributed simply to the self-selection into specific communities of individuals already predisposed to certain levels of political involvement or attitudes toward political participation.

A number of research strategies are available to help determine whether it is actually the experience of living in a particular community which influences the attitudes and behavior of individual residents. First, it is possible to examine individuals who have lived in a community and have been exposed to the political milieu of the community for varying lengths of time. If non-spurious contextual effects were operative, we would expect increased length of residence in a participant-oriented

community to be associated with higher frequencies of individual political participation, an expectation which is supported by our data for low-income migrants in Mexico City. Similarly, it has been found that leftist radicalism among Chilean slum dwellers rises with increased length of residence in communities where this political orientation predominates (Portes, 1971b: 831).

An alternate approach to the problem consists of attempting to separate the socialization effects of the present community of residence from those of previous places of residence. This procedure requires sufficient data on the characteristics of these past communities of residence to enable us to characterize them in terms of their socio-political ambience. For most respondents in our sample of migrants who had resided in one or more areas of Mexico City in addition to the community in which they were interviewed, we have data only on the location of these past places of residence within the metropolitan area. However, a small proportion of these respondents (about 20% of the total sample) had previously resided for varying lengths of time in central city tenement slums, known locally as vecindades, which in Mexico City and elsewhere in Latin America have been found to exhibit significantly lower levels of political interest and participation than other types of low-income residential environments (see Collier, 1971: 139-140; Dietz, 1972; Eckstein, 1973; Lewis, 1961; Mercado Villar, 1970: 224-225, 262-263). Our data for the subpopulation of former central-city slum residents show little relationship between prior residence in such areas and current patterns of political involvement. There is a very weak negative correlation ( $r = -0.092$ ,  $p < .008$ ) between a history of vecindad residence (three or more years) and overall frequency of political participation, controlling for the effects of age, socioeconomic status, length of urban residence, and psychological involvement in politics. Other studies of the effect of neighborhood context on political behavior in the United States have also suggested an immediacy of the community contextual effect. Their findings suggest that "the past residential history of a person has little impact on his mode of response to (neighborhood) problems where he lives at present....The place in which people presently live tends to obliterate the effect of the place in which they have lived previously" (Orbell, 1970: 644-645; Orbell and Uno, 1972: 483).

Community Contextual Effects: Causal Processes

A number of theories and models have been advanced to explain the way in which one's community of residence comes to influence his attitudes and behavior. One such model, rooted in reference group theory, emphasizes direct, unmediated contextual effects resulting from a desire to conform to certain perceived community norms. According to this model, the community surrounds each resident with a certain normative structure or climate of opinion, as well as certain pressures reinforcing group norms. "People absorb the cultural values which surround them and respond to the demands of the situation" (Orbell, 1970: 636). Individual sensitivity to community influence thus depends upon the extent to which the resident perceives the existence of well-defined community norms as well as the existence of group pressure to conform to such norms.

An alternative explanation of the causal mechanisms at work focuses upon social structure and interaction, and views community influence as mediated by the network of social relationships in which the resident is enmeshed. These may include relationships with community leaders as well as friends and relatives residing within the area (Barton, 1970: 226-227). Thus the extent to which community context will affect individual attitudes and behavior depends upon his exposure to social communication within the community and his frequency of interaction, both formal and informal, with other residents. This model implies that people can be influenced by their community environment "even if they are not motivated to conform to community norms, indeed even if they are unaware that such norms exist" (Putnam, 1966: 641).<sup>19</sup>

By performing the contextual analysis reported above upon different subgroups of respondents within our sample of migrants to Mexico City, we can gain a greater insight into the underlying processes and mechanisms through which community effects operate. When individual attributes are held constant, the magnitude of the partial correlation coefficients computed for various subgroups can be interpreted as a measure of their relative sensitivity to the community political milieu (Cf. Tannenbaum and Bachman, 1964: 591; Sewell and Armer, 1966: 168). Once again we examine the relationships between individual political participation (the dependent variable) and certain global or aggregate characteristics of the

community of residence (frequency of political participation in the community, level of civic-mindedness, disposition to conform to community norms, perceptions of external threat, and self-help orientation).

In Table 9 we examine the relationships between individual and contextual variables among a number of subgroups defined in terms of the way in which migrants perceive and orient themselves toward their community. We find that those who possess a higher sense of personal identification with the community ("psychological integration into the community"), who perceive themselves as permanent residents, and who are more disposed to conform to community norms, exhibit greater sensitivity to the local political context. Those who perceive a high level of concern for community problems among their neighbors, who regard most residents as supporters of a single political party, and who perceive a high level of community cohesion are also influenced more strongly by the community political context. These findings are consistent with the predictions of the "normative conformity" model of community influence, which stresses psychological attachment to the community, awareness of community standards, and sensitivity to pressures for conformity.

The relationship between extent of formal and informal social interaction within the community and sensitivity to the local political context is demonstrated by the data reported in Table 10. They indicate that the political behavior of migrants with a higher level of social integration into their community of residence is more strongly influenced by characteristics of the community than those whose social interaction within the community is more limited. Specifically, those whose interaction with close friends and relatives is confined largely to their community of residence, those who participate in voluntary associations within the community, and those who frequently discuss community-related problems with other residents of the community are more receptive to community influence.

Numerous studies have demonstrated that local leaders often serve as important channels along which community influence flows (Cf. Eisenstadt, 1965: 323-337; Frey and Roos, 1967: 26ff; Jacob et al., 1972). Thus we would expect that those residents who perceive a well-defined leadership structure within their community, and are positively oriented toward local leaders, would be more exposed to community standards regarding political

TABLE 9. CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES WITH INDIVIDUAL POLITICAL PARTICIPATION, AMONG SUBGROUPS OF MIGRANTS - I<sup>a</sup>

Subgroup Characteristic	r <sub>1</sub>	r <sub>2</sub>	r <sub>3</sub>	r <sub>4</sub>	r <sub>5</sub>
Low psychological integration into community of residence (N=386) .....	.300	.252	.163	.137	.179
High psychological integration into community of residence (N=276) .....	.328	.292	.263	.258	.183
Low perception of general concern in community for community problems (N=198) .....	.174	.109*	-.022*	.020*	.075*
High perception of general concern in community for community problems (N=466) ..	.420	.394	.346	.295	.300
No perception of one-party dominance in community of residence (N=220) .....	.269	.248	.216	.250	.221
Perceive one-party dominance in community of residence (N=442) .....	.410	.377	.326	.266	.294
Low perception of solidarity among residents of community (N=82) .....	.311	.038*	-.092*	.019*	.165*
High perception of solidarity among residents of community (N=582) .....	.403	.374	.321	.273	.275
Low disposition to conform to community norms (N=299) .....	.261	.214	---	.115	.166
High disposition to conform to community norms (N=365) .....	.449	.417	---	.352	.301
Intend to move from community (N=77) .....	-.116*	.023*	.098*	-.035*	.015*
Intend to remain in community (N=589) .....	.417	.360	.295	.273	.274

<sup>a</sup>The correlations reported in Tables 9, 10, and 11 represent fifth-order partial correlations of selected contextual variables with individual political participation, controlling for the effects of age, socioeconomic status, length of urban residence, psychological involvement in politics, and individual orientations toward political participation. The contextual variables employed in this analysis are the same independent variables used in the analysis reported in Table 8. Correlations reported in the first column of Tables 9 through 11 (r<sub>1</sub>) measure the relationship between level of overall political participation in the respondent's community of residence and his own frequency of political participation. (CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

TABLE 9 (Continued)

---

Correlations appearing in the second column of these tables ( $r_2$ ) measure the relationship between degree of civic mindedness in community of residence and individual political participation. Correlations appearing in the third column ( $r_3$ ) measure the relationship between general disposition to conform to community norms in community of residence and individual political participation. Correlations appearing in the fourth column ( $r_4$ ) measure the relationship between perception of external threat in community of residence and individual political participation. Correlations appearing in the last column ( $r_5$ ) of each table measure the relationship between strength of self-help orientation in community of residence and individual political participation. All coefficients reported are statistically significant at the .05 level or beyond, unless otherwise noted (\*).

TABLE 10. CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES WITH INDIVIDUAL POLITICAL PARTICIPATION, AMONG SUBGROUPS OF MIGRANTS - II

<u>Subgroup Characteristic</u>	$r_1$	$r_2$	$r_3$	$r_4$	$r_5$
Low overall social integration into community of residence (N=397) .....	.304	.288	.228	.165	.228
High overall social integration into community of residence (N=264) .....	.487	.409	.332	.388	.270
-----					
Infrequently discuss community problems with other residents (N=532) .....	.363	.320	.235	.222	.243
Frequently discuss community problems with other residents (N=132) .....	.475	.423	.404	.344	.275
-----					
Lack close friends living in same community (N=360) .....	.362	.359	.287	.213	.285
Have close friends living in same community (N=304) .....	.415	.320	.298	.326	.201
-----					
Lack close relatives living in same community (N=503) .....	.364	.343	.270	.245	.253
Have close relatives living in same community (N=162) .....	.461	.360	.323	.312	.265
-----					
Do not participate in community improvement organizations (N=411) .....	.129	.153	.098	.089	.110
Participate in community improvement organizations (N=253) .....	.466	.406	.386	.329	.284
-----					
Low perception of community leadership structure (N=319) .....	.040*	-.015*	-.039*	-.130	-.021*
High perception of community leadership structure (N=345) .....	.348	.296	.269	.255	.229
-----					
Negative evaluation of community leadership performance (N=282) .....	.260	.184	.103	.018*	.127
Positive evaluation of community leadership performance (N=382) .....	.374	.342	.310	.295	.248

activity and more sensitive to those standards. The data for our sample of migrants strongly support these expectations. The above findings suggest that the psychological and social-psychological processes specified by both the "normative conformity" and "social interaction" models of community influence are important in explaining why community characteristics are related to individual political behavior. To a large extent, local political influence is mediated by informal social interaction networks and the formal organizational structure of the community. Yet awareness of community norms and motivated conformity to such norms also appear to play a significant role in influencing individual political behavior. Undoubtedly there are important inter-relationships among these processes and mechanisms, with higher levels of social interaction strengthening perceptions of community standards and pressures for conformity to such standards. The two basic models we have examined should thus be regarded as complementary rather than alternative explanations of the transmission of community political influence.

#### Individual Susceptibility to Community Contextual Effects

It is reasonable to expect that individuals will vary in terms of their susceptibility to community political influence. Research on political communication and attitude change documents the fact that receptivity to political stimuli in one's social environment varies considerably according to certain socio-demographic and socio-psychological characteristics (see Cox, 1969: 160 ff.). To identify some of these individual variations in susceptibility to community contextual effects we shall again examine the strength of relationships between individual political participation and community political context, measuring these relationships separately within subgroups of respondents.

In Table 11 the total sample interviewed in our Mexico City survey is broken down into five subgroups defined in terms of length of residence in the Mexico City metropolitan area. Controlling for the effects of age, socioeconomic status, psychological involvement in politics, and individual orientations toward political participation, we find that migrants in general, and those most recently arrived in the city in particular, exhibit higher sensitivity to the community political context than native-

TABLE 11. CORRELATIONS OF SELECTED CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES WITH INDIVIDUAL POLITICAL PARTICIPATION, AMONG SUBGROUPS OF MIGRANT AND NATIVE RESPONDENTS - III

<u>Subgroup Characteristic</u>	$r_1$	$r_2$	$r_3$	$r_4$	$r_5$
Less than 5 years of residence in Mexico					
City (N=110) .....	.593	.557	.572	.419	.503
5-9 years of residence in Mexico City (N=155) ..	.543	.538	.493	.391	.429
10 or more years of residence in Mexico City (but not entire lifetime) (N=392) .....	.280	.226	.106	.177	.142
Migrated to Mexico City after age 15 (all migrants in sample, regardless of length of urban residence) (N=676) .....	.396	.355	.295	.267	.262
Born and raised in Mexico City (N=374) .....	.348	.252	.190	.215	.160
Under 35 years of age (N=266) .....	.490	.462	.448	.377	.328
35 years of age or older (N=398) .....	.325	.281	.185	.189	.223
Migrant head of family (N=610) .....	.395	.345	.291	.253	.252
Eldest son of migrant family head (N=54) .....	.382	.473	.304	.487	.357
Low trust in people (N=491) .....	.392	.354	.265	.245	.260
High trust in people (N=174) .....	.424	.324	.381	.310	.293
Low disposition to work collectively (N=318) ...	-.042*	-.004*	-.011*	.009*	.019*
High disposition to work collectively (N=347) ..	.359	.295	.250	.186	.246
Low religiosity (N=398) .....	.326	.308	.213	.207	.207
High religiosity (N=266) .....	.477	.417	.415	.383	.374
Not employed in large-scale enterprise (N=383) ..	.337	.306	.255	.204	.242
Employed in large-scale enterprise (N=281) .....	.473	.424	.371	.344	.308

born Mexico City residents. These differences are understandable in light of what is known of the problems and mechanisms of psychological adjustment among migrants (see Brody, 1970; Morse, 1971: 30-36). It has long been recognized that migration from a rural to an urban environment places major adjustive burdens upon those involved in such movement. Eisenstadt's work on the assimilation of immigrant populations (Eisenstadt, 1965: Chaps. 12, 14) vividly illustrates the degree of uncertainty and anxiety about establishing relations with other people in the host community which frequently characterizes such populations:

The individual feels that he faces undefined, unknown behavior on the part of other people and is not certain of being able to establish stable relations with them....This anxiety is closely related to the fear of not attaining, or of losing, one's place in the collectivity or wider society of which one is a member...  
(Eisenstadt, 1965: 317)

As long as such uncertainty about his place and status within the community persists, the migrant can be expected to orient himself more strongly to the local urban community as a reference group, both as a function of lack of knowledge about proper behavior within the new environment and of a felt need to win social acceptance within his community of residence.

Individual receptiveness to community influence is also likely to vary with different stages in the life cycle (Michelson, 1970: 95-110; Orbell and Uno, 1972: 485-486; Suttles, 1972: 37). Since several of the communities included in our Mexico City study are of relatively recent origin, older people may not differ appreciably from their younger neighbors in terms of length of exposure to the community political context. Yet socialization theory would lead us to expect that older residents are relatively less susceptible to most political learning experiences than their younger counterparts (Cf. Brim, 1965; Orbell, 1970: 647-648). As indicated in Table 11, this appears to be the case for migrants residing in our Mexican research communities. With the effects of socioeconomic status, length of urban residence, and individual political orientations held constant, those under 35 years of age exhibit considerably greater susceptibility to community political influence, as does a subsample of eldest sons of first-generation migrants to the city. This generational difference is particularly interesting in light of conventional theorizing

which predicts that at the stage of life where a young person is employed and unmarried the local community may well have its weakest influence upon his attitudes and behavior (see Mann, 1970: 575-576). A majority of those respondents represented in our subsample of eldest sons are young single adults employed outside their community of residence.

In several previous studies of U.S. populations, religious orientation -- defined in terms of denominational preference or religiosity -- has been found to be an important factor influencing individual susceptibility to community political influence (Cf. Foladare, 1968; Putnam, 1966: 648; Segal and Meyer, 1969: 228). Table 11 reports the relevant data for our sample of migrants in Mexico City. We find that those migrants exhibiting a higher degree of religiosity, operationalized as intensity of religious feeling and frequency of church attendance, are more sensitive to the local political context than their less religious counterparts. As one investigator has hypothesized, high religiosity may be an important factor promoting the interpersonal trust which predisposes residents of low-income urban communities to communal political involvement (Behrman, 1971, 1972; Lutz, 1970: 137). But we suspect that the differences reported here can be attributed largely to the fact that frequent church attendance -- almost always within the migrant's community of residence, or in nearby churches also frequented by his neighbors -- increases receptiveness to community influence simply by expanding the extent of contact and social communication with other residents of the community.

It could also be hypothesized that certain types of psychological characteristics and socialization experiences increase individual susceptibility to community influence by predisposing residents toward cooperating politically with their neighbors. Thus we would expect that those possessing a higher level of trust in people and a collective orientation toward problem solving would be more susceptible to community political influence. Similarly, we would expect that exposure to various kinds of collective stress situations -- land invasions, community confrontations with landowners, police or government officials, widespread flooding, major fires, and other disasters -- would strengthen individual predispositions to cooperative activity. Such experiences may have an important unifying and politicizing effect upon a community and are often instrumental in overcoming distrust of neighbors and community leaders. Occupational socialization

may also make a contribution. It has been hypothesized that employment in large-scale enterprises (particularly factories and construction firms) predisposes individuals to be favorable to cooperative political involvement with fellow workers and neighbors (Roberts, 1970a: 368-369). The data reported in Table 11 provide support for all of these expectations. Migrants whose psychological traits or socialization experiences may predispose them toward cooperative political activity -- those characterized by a high level of interpersonal trust, a strong collective orientation toward problem solving, greater exposure to collective stress situations, and employment in large-scale enterprises -- manifest greater sensitivity to the community political context. Since positive orientations toward cooperative political activity appear to increase the salience of the local urban community as an agent of political socialization among the migrant poor, it is important to specify the structural and situational characteristics of communities which are most conducive to the development of such orientations. It is to this task which we turn in the following section.

#### Community Characteristics and the Development of a Cooperative Political Ethos

It is evident that a normative structure supportive of communal political activity emerges only in certain kinds of community settings. A review of the literature on political behavior in low-income urban communities in Latin America, together with qualitative data gathered for the six-community study in Mexico City reported above, enable us to identify a number of factors bearing importantly upon the development of a cooperative political ethos. Among them are the following:

Size and Density of Population. City planners and students of collective behavior in urban subcommunities have long recognized the principle that "the physical space that neighbors occupy is inversely proportional to the likelihood of interaction" among them (Schorr, 1970: 720; Cf. Festinger, et al., 1950; Michelson, 1970: 168-190). The results of a number of field studies conducted in low-income urban communities in Latin America support Lutz's contention that "smallness probably encourages a sense of community feeling and identification, communication, and communal interest within a settlement and reduces settlement problems to more manageable

proportions" (Lutz, 1970: 118; Cf. Roberts, 1970a: 365). A smaller, more densely populated community can be mobilized more rapidly and effectively by local leaders for community self-help projects and other collective activities (see Cornelius, 1972a). Social control and pressures for conformity to local norms are also likely to be stronger in smaller communities, because of the more frequent opportunities for social interaction and scrutiny of residents' behavior which such communities afford (Cf. Mann, 1970: 580; Rogler, 1967: 521-527). In communities with a strong tradition of cooperative political activity, non-participation in such activity may be regarded as a form of deviant behavior. In general, smallness encourages and facilitates widespread resident participation in community problem-solving efforts.<sup>20</sup>

Socioeconomic Homogeneity. Community size is also important because it tends to be strongly correlated with internal socioeconomic differentiation. As Leeds has observed in squatter settlements of Rio de Janeiro and Lima, Peru, "the larger the squatment, the more diversified the types of social groups, aggregates, and association, and the more of them both absolutely and relatively" (Leeds, 1969: 78). Studies of urban community behavior in the United States (Foladare, 1968: 525; Gans, 1961a: 136-137; Tomeh, 1969), Latin America (Calderón Alvarado, 1963: 162-163ff.; Dietz, 1972: Chap. 5; MacEwen, 1971; Vanderschueren, 1971a: 84) and the Soviet Union (Frolic, 1970: 683) have demonstrated the importance of socioeconomic homogeneity to the development of community identification and a cooperative ethos. Extreme heterogeneity in social status tends to retard recognition of mutual interests among community residents. Moreover, the presence of substantial numbers of middle and upper-middle class residents in a predominantly low status community may provide a basis for higher levels of community conflict over such issues as leadership recruitment and political demand-making strategies. Moreover, such residents often seek to isolate themselves from social interaction networks within the community, and it is usually more difficult to enlist their participation in community self-help projects and other collaborative activities.

Stability of Residence. As an early Chicago School sociologist observed many years ago, "rapid community turnover...plays havoc with local standards and neighborhood mores. It is impossible to have an efficient local opinion

in a neighborhood where the people are in constant movement" (McKenzie, 1972: 43). High instability of residence within a community inhibits not only the generation of well-defined community norms, but the formation of on-going social interaction networks capable of maintaining such norms (see Roberts, 1970a: 372-373). As demonstrated above, both normative structure and social interaction processes are crucial to the transmission of community political influence. Community cohesion and capacities for collective political action are also diminished by the presence of large numbers of recently-arrived residents who have not shared in key socialization experiences, occurring at earlier stages of the community's development, such as original land invasion through which a squatter settlement might be established (see Dietz, 1972: Chap. 5; Goldrich, 1970b).

Location within the City. The location of a community within the metropolitan complex may have important implications for the development of community consciousness and cohesion. Spatial separation from other communities and unequivocally recognized territorial boundaries facilitate perception of the community by its residents as a distinct segment of urban space with which they may identify. And as Lutz has pointed out, leaders and improvement associations can represent residents of the community before government authorities with less argument or ambiguity (Lutz, 1970: 120; Cf. Peattie, 1968: 54). Proximity to another neighborhood characterized by significantly higher levels of cooperative political activity or a rapid rate of community development may produce a "demonstration effect" which stimulates collaborative activity within the community. Finally, the distance of the community from sources of employment in the central city may have an important bearing upon residents' capacities for cooperative political activity. Residents of communities far removed from most sources of employment will usually have much less time to spend on such activities than inhabitants of more centrally located areas (see Roberts, 1970a: 365; Turner, 1971).

Type of Origin. The conditions under which a low-income urban community is established are often among the most important determinants of its subsequent developmental trajectory as well as patterns of political cooperation or non-cooperation which may emerge within it. As noted above, a land invasion -- whether organized or spontaneously initiated -- may

constitute a crucial unifying and politicizing experience for community residents. This is particularly true if the initial seizure of land is followed by repeated attempts by the government or private landowners to forcibly remove the squatters from the occupied land.<sup>21</sup> The illegal origins of squatter settlements also define their pattern of relationships with political and governmental agencies for many years to come, and create a highly salient community problem -- insecurity of land tenure -- upon which cooperative political activity among the residents may focus. These conditions do not normally apply to communities created by government fiat (e.g. housing projects, resettlement areas for slum dwellers displaced by urban renewal) or by private land developers. Nor do they apply to squatter settlements whose growth has been crecive and unchallenged by landowners or the government (Cf. Butterworth, 1971: 20).

History of Relationships with Supra-Local Authority Structures. As Suttles (1972: 51) has noted, "neighborhoods seem to acquire their identity through an ongoing commentary between themselves and outsiders." For the kinds of low-income urban communities discussed in this paper, the most important "outsiders" are usually government officials, politicians, and other authority figures possessing resources relevant to community development. These supra-local actors may influence community orientations toward political participation in a variety of ways, but particularly through negative sanctions which may be applied to the community as a result of its illegal origins and through responses to collective demand-making efforts made by community residents. The possibility that negative sanctions may be invoked and the high perception of external threat to community values it engenders among the residents tends to exert an integrating influence upon the community. The old social-psychological maxim of "out-group hostility, in-group solidarity" appears to have considerable relevance here:

Without experiencing and resisting outside hostility, there is little likelihood of in-group solidarity; without in-group solidarity, there is no possibility of effective collective action; without the latter, there is no chance of accelerated progress...A land invasion is an illegal and dangerous action; precisely because it is illegal and dangerous it is capable of giving rise to social processes powerful enough to form communities out of masses...In general, the more protracted and

and difficult the initial invasion, the stronger and more durable the resulting social cohesiveness among participants and the higher their capabilities for collective action.

(Portes, 1971b: 243)

Perceptions of external threat may also constitute an important factor motivating conformity to community norms. Rokkan's studies of elite populations in western Europe demonstrated that "increased threats to the values of the group would lead to increased tendencies to conform to common group policies, increased pressures on others to conform, and increased rejection of deviants from group policies" (Aubert, Fisher, Rokkan, 1954: 27; Cf. Rokkan, 1955: 594). His principal hypothesis is also supported by findings from our study of migrants to Mexico City. The relevant data, reported in Table 12, show that those respondents who perceive a high degree of external threat are significantly more disposed to conformist behavior in general and particularly to conformity with community norms. The politicization of residents of an externally "threatened" community resulting from fears of negative sanctions may play an important role in achieving community solidarity and mobilizing residents for cooperative political activity, but its effects may be relatively short-lived if the principal source of threat to the community is suddenly removed (e.g., through official recognition of land occupation rights).<sup>22</sup>

Governmental responses to communal political demand-making efforts may also be crucial to the development of cooperative political orientations among community residents. The positive or negative outcomes of such demand-making experiences are likely to affect residents' perceptions of the likelihood of success in future contacts with public officials. To the extent that most demand-making efforts have met with indifferent or inadequate responses by the authorities contacted, it will be increasingly difficult to maintain a high level of cooperative political participation among community residents. As Lipsky (1970) has observed, motivations for such participation among low-status groups can be sustained over time only if the members have reasonably high expectations of governmental responsiveness. Commenting on such problems with reference to community improvement organizations in three Latin American cities, Lutz (1970: 287, 292) observes that in Guayaquil, Ecuador, squatter organizations have brought their members into contact with "a political system unable

TABLE 12. IMPACT OF PERCEPTIONS OF EXTERNAL THREAT UPON DISPOSITIONS  
TOWARD CONFORMIST BEHAVIOR, AMONG MIGRANTS\*

---



---

Overall disposition toward conformist behavior	Perceptions of external threat	
	Low	High
Low	66.5%	40.9%
High	33.5	59.1

---

Disposition to conform to community norms	Perceptions of external threat	
	Low	High
Low	53.8%	25.5%
High	46.2	74.5

---

\*Based on an N of 678. Differences between proportions are statistically significant, by Chi-square test, at the .001 level.

or unwilling to respond satisfactorily to their petitions and demands.... Thus it is quite rational for squatters to learn through organizational experience that they have less competence in influencing government than they might otherwise have thought" (Lutz, 1970: 287, 292; Cf. Cornelius, 1972b).

Community Leadership and Organization. We have already referred to the key role which community leaders may play in the generation and transmission of community political standards. To the extent that standards defined by such leaders stress high resident participation in community-related problem-solving, leadership may contribute significantly to the development of a local climate of opinion supportive of cooperative political activity. Residents may be less than receptive to such opinion leadership if the legitimacy of community leaders is in question or if leader dishonesty or poor performance in securing material benefits for the community has alienated many of the residents (see Behrman, 1972: 279; Cornelius, 1972a). Some low-income communities in Latin American cities have suffered from a nearly complete lack of strong, trusted leadership, owing to their origins in illegal land invasions led by professional organizers. These individuals, who are usually land speculators or agents of politicians or government bureaucrats, normally have no permanent interests in the community; and their early departure creates a vacuum which is often filled by non-indigenous leadership imposed by the government for purposes of control and electoral mobilization (see Eckstein, 1973; Lutz, 1967: 31-36, 123-129). The presence or absence of formal voluntary associations in the community is another structural characteristic of the community affecting its capacity for collective political action. Indirectly, such organizations can accelerate the political socialization process among community residents by facilitating the formation of informal social interaction networks (Cf. Litwak, 1970: 587). If a community association concerns itself primarily with local developmental needs and negotiations with the authorities to satisfy such needs, it may exert a direct influence upon political learning among its members.<sup>23</sup>

Patterns of Internal Political Cleavage and Competition. Fragmentation of a low-income urban community into competing political factions is one of the most serious impediments to collective political action.

Such factionalism may result from controversies between various community leaders who head community councils or improvement associations competing for the support of the residents (Cf. Butterworth, 1971: 16-18; Cornelius, 1972b). In countries possessing a competitive party system, the divisive influence of partisan political activity is often a major cause of political fragmentation in low-income urban communities. Community organizations and leaders in such communities frequently become targets of penetration and cooptation by political parties vying for working-class electoral support.<sup>24</sup> Apart from the internal divisions and conflicts spawned by partisan competition within the community, the concerns of local organizations in such "penetrated" communities may be reoriented away from community problem-solving activity and toward electoral campaigns. When supra-local interests and concerns become the dominant influence in community organizational activities, resident participation declines and the organizational structure itself may disintegrate. While some studies indicate that internal political cleavages and competition do not represent an insurmountable obstacle to cooperation among community residents (see Butterworth, 1971: 16; Roberts, 1970a: 367), most evidence suggests that it is an elusive goal under such conditions.

Developmental Problems and Needs. In most low-income urban communities in Latin America, the most important stimulus to cooperative political activity among the residents is the set of community-related developmental problems and needs which must be met if the quality of their dwelling environment is to be improved significantly. In communities characterized by insecurity of land tenure, the highest priority is usually attached to securing officially recognized title to the land. Next in importance is the installation of basic urban services such as water and sewage systems and electricity, followed by the introduction of urban improvements such as street paving and the construction of schools, public markets, health care centers, and other community facilities.<sup>25</sup> While such problems exist, they provide a focus for internal self-help efforts as well as attempts to influence the allocative decisions of government agencies. But once the most acute developmental problems are resolved, rates of participation in community improvement associations and all other forms of cooperative political activity tend to decline sharply. This illustrates a necessary condition for sustained political mobilization of the

low-income urban community: there must be a strong and continuing need for mutual assistance and cooperation, deriving from the existence of a set of problems which can be addressed most effectively through collective political action.

Conclusion: Some Implications for the Study of Political Learning Among Low-Income Urban Groups

The principal conclusions to which we are led by the above analysis can be summarized as follows. Even within single cities, there is considerable variation in the form and content of political learning experiences obtained from one local community to another. It has been found that such within-city differentiation in political socialization patterns is a major source of variance in individual political attitudes and behavior among the migrant poor. This helps to explain why mere length of exposure to the urban environment is such a poor predictor of political participation frequency, a finding which has emerged with considerable generality in recent empirical studies.<sup>26</sup> Thus it becomes clear that attempts to identify those factors which significantly affect the ways in which immigrant populations become involved in and form attitudes toward the political process must focus explicitly upon the impact of different kinds of social contexts to which they are exposed.

In a recent study of political participation in the United States, Austria, India, Japan, and Nigeria, Verba and his colleagues propose a number of alternative models to explain the process of politicization. The analysis presented in this paper suggests that the most adequate conceptualization of the politicization process among low-income urban populations in Latin America and other developing areas would incorporate elements from two of these models: the group consciousness model, which specifies that individuals come to participate in politics "through development of a sense of group consciousness, usually based on a shared sense of some deprivation;" and the personal-relevance of government model, which predicts that people will come to participate "out of an awareness of the relevance to them of specific governmental programs. They are apolitical in the broader meaning of politics, but they may be aware of and interested in governmental activities where those activities closely impinge on their lives".<sup>27</sup> The research reported in this paper points to

the importance of one additional factor, i.e., the differential opportunity structure of communities of residence, in explaining the process of politicization among low-income urban groups. Here we refer to the range and frequency of opportunities for political involvement to which people are exposed by virtue of their residence in specific communities.<sup>28</sup> Age, socioeconomic status, subjective political competence, interest in politics, and other personal characteristics may, of course, influence the extent to which individuals are able and choose to avail themselves of these opportunities. But actual behavior does not depend upon individual motivations or social status characteristics alone.

Among a substantial proportion of the population in many low-income communities in Latin American cities, it is evident that low levels of political awareness and low socioeconomic status per se have not proven to be insurmountable obstacles to involvement in political activity. For example, in our sample of low-income migrants to Mexico City we find that occupational status accounts for less than one percent of the variance in our measure of overall political participation; and level of educational attainment (operationalized as total years of schooling completed) is significantly related to participation only among those people having at least some secondary education. Of the three components of our index of socioeconomic status (occupational status, educational attainment, and family income), only family income level correlates with political participation at the .10 level or above. Overall socioeconomic status accounts for less than one percent of the variance in participation. Even if we take into consideration the relatively restricted range of variation on our measure of socioeconomic status within a predominantly low-income population, this finding is rather striking in view of the importance usually attributed to status variables in explaining political participation frequency (see Verba and Nie, 1972: Chap. 9).

Such findings suggest that given sufficient opportunities for political learning, together with community-based organizational support, low-status people may participate more frequently than others located at considerably higher levels of the social hierarchy. Given the existence of a set of needs for which the government is perceived as the relevant problem-solving agency, propensities toward political participation as a means of need satisfaction appear to be more a function of the extent and nature

of opportunities for involvement in politically-relevant learning experiences than of individual social background characteristics or supportive psychological orientations toward participation such as a high sense of political efficacy or a generalized interest in politics (Cf. Powell, 1969: 212-215).

This analysis is consistent with the theoretical assumptions of a model of neighborhood problem-solving behavior recently proposed by Orbell and Uno and tested with data from the United States. They suggest that an individual's participation in such problem-solving activity should be viewed as "a response to a need he experiences in his environment (or at least the neighborhood part of it), and as directed toward some agency, usually government, that has the power to do something about it" (Orbell and Uno, 1972: 475-476). The findings of studies such as these demonstrate the need both for a reevaluation of conventional explanations of political participation and for increased attention to the role of the local urban community in the process of political learning.

We have observed that under certain conditions, the community may serve as an agent of rapid, intense political socialization.<sup>29</sup> We have also noted that participant behavior among migrants to the city changes in response to changing needs and other situational constraints in the migrant's community of residence. Politicization resulting from neighborhood socialization experiences may be so situationally-relevant that the individual so politicized may become completely inactive in a political sense once community-related needs and problems are dealt with to his satisfaction. This may not, however, represent a process of "depoliticization" or "unlearning," as some investigators have suggested. Community residents may have developed a latent capacity for cooperative political action which may be mobilized or reactivated when new needs arise or extra-local constraints are altered. Longitudinal studies of specific communities will be needed to evaluate the relative "staying power" and generalizability of community-induced political learning.

## NOTES

1. See, for example, Behrman (1970, 1971), Cornelius (1972b), Dietz (1972), Eckstein (1972a), Goldrich (1970a), Lutz (1970), Perlman (1971), Portes (1970), and Roberts (1970a, 1970b).
2. The early Chicago School conception of urban residential differentiation is explicated in Park (1952: 17ff.). The work of Park and his colleagues as well as other studies stimulated by their view of the city are summarized in Timms (1971: Chap. 1), and Johnston (1972).
3. See, for example, Altschuler (1970), Fellin and Litwak (1968), Fried and Gleicher (1970), Gans (1962), Hunter (1968: 171-206), Keller (1968), Kotler (1969, 1971), Marshall (1968), and Suttles (1972).
4. See, for example, Butterworth (1971), Goldrich (1970a, 1970b), Mercado Villar (1970), Portes (1971a, 1971b), Rogler (1967), and Stokes (1962).
5. The data were gathered during 13 months of field work in 1970 and 1971, utilizing a combination of field methods, including a sample survey, participant observation, use of key informants, documentary research, and informal, depth interviewing of local leaders. The discussion which follows relies both upon the sample survey data and upon the qualitative data gathered through less highly structured field techniques. For the sample survey a stratified probability sample of approximately 120 male heads of family were interviewed in each of the six communities. The total number of interviews conducted was 747. Approximately two thirds of the respondents were migrants (defined as persons who had spent all or most of their time between the ages of 5 and 15 living outside of the Mexico City metropolitan area). Except where indicated, the analysis reported in this paper deals only with these migrant respondents. Migrants with longer residence in Mexico City were deliberately undersampled to enable greater representation of more recently-arrived migrants in the sample. In analyzing the survey results, the undersampled stratum of longer-term urban residents was upweighted to correspond with actual population parameters. For a more detailed description of sample design and other aspects of the methodology of the study, see Cornelius (1972b).
6. Politicization is defined here as the learning process by which people become aware of the relevance of government and politics to need satisfaction, and become involved in activities aimed at need satisfaction through governmental action. Following Daniel Goldrich (1965), we find it useful to conceptualize the politicization process as a continuum ranging from lack of perception of the relevance of government and politics to one's life, through perception of it, to active involvement in politics. It thus incorporates both cognitive and behavioral dimensions of political involvement. For a fuller analysis,

concerned particularly with identifying the personal characteristics of low-income migrants who exhibit high levels of political involvement, see Cornelius (1973).

7. See Bell (1965: 257) and Michelson (1966; 1970: 131-147). The apparent failure of suburban neighborhoods in U.S. cities to influence the political attitudes and behavior of incoming residents has led some sociologists to dismiss the local urban community as an important context for political socialization. Greer, for example, has argued that "the social products of the neighborhood per se are small-scale order, mutual aid, and friendship....The interaction of households produces a luxuriant network of neighborhoods in the suburbs, but these have little direct significance for the polity" (Greer, 1970: 607-608).
8. For a stimulating cross-national analysis of the relative importance of various agents of political socialization, which unfortunately omits any consideration of community of residence, see Langton and Karns (1971).
9. See, for example, Roberts (1970b: 21-22), and Vanderschueren (1971b: 122). In the sample of low-income migrants to Mexico City discussed in this paper, only 33.6% of the respondents had ever belonged to a labor union.
10. For analyses of the impact of local community leadership and organization upon political attitude formation among low-income urban populations in Latin America, see Cornelius (1972b), Goldrich (1970b), Lutz (1970), McKenney (1969), Pratt (1971a, 1971b), and Vanderschueren (1971a).
11. It is also apparent that a collective problem-solving orientation enhances the level and quality of participation in community-based voluntary associations, and is directly related to higher frequency of participation in community self-help efforts and collective demand-making aimed at securing external assistance for community development (see Cornelius, 1972b).
12. Interest in empirical investigation of such relationships was apparently revived by the research reported in Stouffer, et al. (1949: 256ff.). Other prominent sociological studies concerned with such problems include Barton (1970), Davis (1962), and Lipset, Coleman, and Trow (1956: 338ff.). See also Eulau (1969) and the studies included in Dogan and Rokkan (1969).
13. See Kendall and Lazarsfeld (1950: 195-196; 1955). While using different terminology, analyses of "compositional effects" (Davis, et al., 1971), "structural effects" (Blau, 1960), and "clustering effects" (Katz and Eldersveld, 1961) are based on the same principle. For reviews of the major variations of this research strategy see Frey (1970: 288-294) and Lane (1959: 261-272). The technique is not without its difficulties of measurement and interpretation of results; see, for example, the exchange between Barton and Hauser (1970) and the discussion by Frey cited above.

14. The principal advantages of contextually grounded survey research and analysis are outlined in Barton (1968), Frey (1970: 288-294), and Verba (1969, 1971). See also Eckstein (1972b: 4-9). Contextual analysis, of course, requires a sample design in which sufficient numbers of respondents are interviewed in each social unit to enable the investigator to characterize the unit in terms of its social or political climate.
15. For more detailed explications of the logic and theoretical assumptions of contextual analysis, see Barton (1970: 209-216ff.), Coleman (1958-59), Lazarsfeld and Menzel (1961), and Scheuch (1969).
16. See Berelson, et al. (1954: 98ff.), Ennis (1962), Foladare (1968), Katz and Eldersveld (1961), Levin (1961), Miller (1956), Putnam (1966), and Segal and Meyer (1969). Limitations of available data required some of these investigators to use data aggregated at the level of the country to specify the political complexion of the community environment.
17. This approach to community contextual analysis is described more fully in Flinn (1970). As pointed out by Frey (1970: 292-293) and Tannenbaum and Bachman (1964), the partial correlation technique helps to avoid problems of interpretation deriving from failure to hold individual characteristics strictly constant. For examples of an alternate approach through analysis of covariance, see Nasatir (1968) and Wilson (1971a, 1971b). The older approach through multivariate tabular analysis is presented in Blau (1960) and Davis, et al. (1961).
18. These findings are consistent with those of studies of intra-city residential mobility in the United States. For a summary of the literature see Orbell and Uno (1972: 474-475). See also, with reference to low-income families in Guatemala City and Oaxaca, Mexico, Butterworth (1971: 25) and Roberts (1970a: 350).
19. See also Young and Wilmott (1957: 135-136).. For more detailed explications of these alternative models of community influence, see Barton (1970: Chap. 5), Campbell (1958), and Sherif and Sherif (1964). Empirical validation for the social interaction model is provided in Campbell and Alexander (1965), Cox (1969: 165-169), Davies (1966: 162-165), Putnam (1966), Robson (1969: 232-235). The model stressing conformity to perceived community norms receives empirical support in Barton (1970: Chap. 5), Flinn (1970), and Sherif and Sherif (1964).
20. In their recent study of political participation in the United States, Verba and Nie also found that "an individual is more likely to engage in communal activity or particularized contacting [of public officials] in a small and isolated community than is another individual of similar social characteristics in a larger place" (Verba and Nie, 1972: Chap. 14).
21. In certain instances, however, it has been found that such collective confrontations involving negative sanctions have failed to sustain

high levels of community cohesion and may have resulted in some degree of "depoliticization" of community residents (see Goldrich, 1970a: 198-201).

22. Cf. Butterworth (1971: 20), Morse (1965: 55), and Rogler (1967: 514-516). See also the discussion of the "defensive mode" of politicization among low-income populations in Latin America in Goldrich (1965: 367-368), and the analysis of social behavior in "defended neighborhoods" within U.S. cities in Suttles (1972: 34-35ff.). A theoretical model of community contextual effects also stressing residents' reactions to some outside stimulus is proposed in Campbell (1958: 321-322).
23. Participation in community-level improvement organizations in Latin American cities has been observed to have a rather selective impact upon the politicization process. In general, such organizational involvement has been found to be associated with higher frequency of participation in other forms of political activity, but has had little impact on levels of political information, subjective political competence, and other non-behavioral dimensions or attitudinal correlates of politicization. See Lutz (1970), McKenny (1969), Pratt (1971a, 1971b).
24. The forms and consequences of partisan political activity in low-income communities in Latin American cities are described in Lutz (1970: 124, 294 et passim), Peattie (1968: 56-57ff.), Powell (1969), Ray (1969: Chap. 7), Roberts (1970a: 374-376), Rogler (1967: 520-521), and Vanderschueren (1971a: 68-76). For a detailed analysis of the efforts of nominally non-political agencies and institutions to penetrate and control such communities in Lima, Peru, see Rodriguez et al. (1972).
25. The agenda for community development which low-income groups in Latin American cities define for themselves is analyzed in Andrews and Phillips (1970), Butterworth (1971: 32-33), Cornelius (1972b), and Dietz (1972). It is important to note the discrepancy which often exists between the priorities attached to various developmental problems and needs by community residents themselves and non-residents. The most conspicuous example of such discrepancies is the stress placed by government officials and city planners upon provision of housing, which is usually perceived by community residents as a problem to be addressed through individual initiative (see Turner, 1971).
26. See Cornelius (1973), Inkeles (1969), Nie, Powell and Prewitt (1969: 365-368), and Perlman (1971: 413-418).
27. Verba, et al (1971c: 62). Verba and his associates find that the "group consciousness model" best approximates the process by which blacks in the U.S. come to participate in campaign and communal problem-solving activities (see Verba, et al., 1971b). This model is based upon the same theoretical assumptions as Durkheim's "collective enthusiasm" theory of social participation (see Pizzorno, 1970: 47-48).

28. Greer and Orleans, drawing upon research conducted in the St. Louis metropolitan area, also emphasize the importance of the differential opportunity structures offered by various areas within the metropolitan complex. They find that formal organizational participation, electoral behavior, degree of perceived political competence, and overall level of political involvement vary widely from one type of social area within the city to another. These differences are explained primarily in terms of variation in the structures of available opportunities for social participation among urban subcommunities (Greer and Orleans, 1962).
29. Indeed, some Latin American political parties and movements, such as the Christian Democratic Party and the Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR) in Chile, have sought to utilize the local urban community as a vehicle for directed political socialization and mobilization. See Petras (1972) and Vanderschueren (1971a: 68-70, 89-90; 1971b: 121).

## APPENDIX I: CONSTRUCTION OF SUMMATIVE INDEXES

### A. Simple Summative Indexes

Most of the variables utilized in the data analysis for this paper are operationalized through additive indexes constructed from responses to three or more items in the main questionnaire administered in connection with the six-community study of migrants to Mexico City (Cornelius, 1972b). The English version of each item incorporated in these indexes is presented in Appendix II. Responses to each item were scored as 0 or 1, dichotomized either on logical grounds or as closely as possible to the median response in the case of items having ordinal response categories indicating intensity of attitude or behavioral predisposition. (For a complete description of item scoring procedures for each index and other aspects of index construction, see the methodological appendices to Cornelius, 1972b.) For each index, a pool of items considered on a priori grounds to be relevant to the variable to be operationalized was isolated and intercorrelations among the items were computed. By inspection of these inter-item correlations, a number of items obviously unrelated to the variable being measured were eliminated. Preliminary indexes were then constructed by summing scores across the remaining items in the index. Item-to-item index correlations were then computed, and those items failing to correlate with the summative index at or above the .30 level were eliminated. The remaining item pools for each index were then factor analyzed according to the principal components technique. Items with loadings of less than .500 on the first unrotated factor extracted were then eliminated, and final index scores were computed by summing scores across the remaining items in each index. Indexes were then validated for internal consistency and reliability by the Spearman-Brown split half technique. To be considered acceptable an index was required to have a reliability coefficient of .80 or above.

### B. Overall Summative Indexes

A number of indexes (e.g., overall political participation, overall life satisfaction, overall social integration into the community) utilized in the analysis were constructed from scores on three or more of the finalized simple additive indexes described above. Since the number of items included varies considerably from one index to another, scores on them were standardized according to the z-score transformation procedure to insure that each component index contributed equally to the respondent's score on the overall summative index. The overall indexes were then constructed by taking the simple sum of the standardized scores on each simple additive index included in the overall index.

Correlational and factor analyses performed for index construction as well as multiple regression and other statistical procedures employed in the data analysis reported in this paper were carried out at the IBM 360/165 computer installation at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, utilizing programs included in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. For a complete description of these programs see Nie, et al. (1970).

APPENDIX II: ITEM CONTENT OF SUMMATIVE INDEXES\*

(FROM TABLE 1)

- (1) Overall Life Satisfaction: Composite index constructed from scores on indexes of relative deprivation, job satisfaction, community satisfaction, sense of individual progress, and satisfaction with economic situation.
- (2) Satisfaction with Urban Environment:
  32. Now that you know Mexico City, are you satisfied with having come here, or would you prefer to have remained in [respondent's place of origin]?
  - 35a. In what ways would you say that living in this city is better than living in [respondent's place of origin]?
  - 35b. In what ways would you say that living in this city is worse than living in [respondent's place of origin]?
  39. Keeping in mind all aspects of life, where do you think that people are generally more satisfied and happy -- in the country or in the city?
  40. Would you say it is easier, more difficult or just about the same to make friends here in Mexico City than it is in [respondent's place of origin]?
  - 41a. Do you think it is more difficult for a provinciano [rural-to-urban migrant] to get ahead in this city than for someone born and raised here, or do you think it makes little difference?
- (3) Perception of External Threat:
  - 102a. Do you know if there have been any attempts by the government or the police to evict or tear down the houses of any residents of this colonia [community]?
  - 102i. Can you recall any other incidents of this nature? How many? Did these things also happen here in this colonia, or somewhere else?
  - 103a. Do you know if there have been any actions of this kind taken by private landowners or subdividers in this colonia? That is, sudden evictions, destruction of houses, and other kinds of abuses?
  - 103i. Can you recall any other incidents of this nature, that happened in this colonia?

---

\*Numbering of individual items corresponds with their order of appearance in the main questionnaire administered in the Mexico City project. Copies of the complete Spanish and English language versions of the survey instrument are available on request from the author.

105b. [If respondent does not feel that his claim to his house and land is secure:] Who is likely to challenge or threaten your possession?

125a. Some people feel that when they are troubled by a problem of the colonia, they can do something about it, such as speak out for or against a solution to the problem, or in some other way attempt to get their opinions considered. Other people feel that this kind of activity can only lead to problems for them. We would like to know your feelings about such matters. Suppose some problem of the colonia comes up, and you are troubled by it, and you decide to do something about it. Would any of the following things be likely to happen?

-- The authorities would try to evict you

173a. Thinking now about the government now in power, that of Díaz Ordaz: Do you believe that this government would ever pass some law or take some kind of action that would be harmful to people like yourself? How likely is it that this would ever occur? Would you say it is very likely, somewhat likely, or not at all likely?

173b. And how about the government for the new sexenio (six year period of government)? -- For example, that of Luis Echeverría, if he is elected to the presidency. Do you think that this government would ever pass some law or take some action that would be harmful to people like yourself? How likely is it that this might happen? Would you say it is very likely, somewhat likely, or not at all likely?

(4) Sense of Individual Progress:

33a. Would you say that the house you have now is much better, somewhat better, more or less the same, worse, or much worse than your house in [respondent's place of origin]?

33b. Think about the house in which you lived just after arriving in Mexico City. Is your present house much better, somewhat better, about the same, worse, or much worse than that in which you lived when you first came to the city?

54. If you had a job in [respondent's place of origin], how do you consider your present job compared with that job? Would you say that your present job is much better, somewhat better, about equal to, worse, or much worse than the job you held in [respondent's place of origin]?

186h. Do you believe that, in general, the economic situation of you and your family at the present time is better, about the same, or worse than your situation before coming to live in Mexico City? Much better [worse], or only a little better [worse]?

64a. Everybody wants certain things in life. Think about what is really important for you...then think of the best life you can imagine, assuming that you could have everything just as you want it. Now think of the kind of life you would not want -- the worse possible life you can imagine. Here is a picture of a ladder. Suppose we say that the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you, and the bottom represents the worse possible life for you. Where on the ladder do you feel you personally stand at the present time?

- 64b. Where on the ladder do you think you stood five years ago?
- 64d. At about what step were you when you first came to live in Mexico City?
- 64e. Nowadays, where on the ladder would you place the average person born in [respondent's place of origin]? That is, someone who was born and raised in that place and who lives there now.
- 64f. And about where would you be now if you had stayed in [respondent's place of origin]?

(5) Sense of Relative Deprivation:

67. Do you think you have more, the same, or fewer opportunities than the majority of people in Mexico to live a good life -- that is, to live happily and in comfort?
- 171c. In comparison with other people living in Mexico, do you think that you are getting your fair share of the good things in life, more than your fair share, or less than your fair share? Much less, or only a little less?
- 186g. In comparison with the majority of families in this colonia, would you say that the economic situation of you and your family is better, worse, or about the same as the others? How much better [worse], or only a little better [worse]?

(6) Perception of Social Inequality:

- 68a. Taking into account what you see around you, would you say there is a great deal of injustice or not so much injustice in this country?
148. What do you think are the most important things that make Mexico different from other countries? [scored according to responses indicating perceived inequality]
147. Think now about the problems of Mexico. In your opinion, what are the most important problems of the country? [scored according to responses indicating perceived inequality]
- 141a. Now I am going to read a list of activities. As I read each type of activity, I would like you to give me your opinion of how well the government is doing in each of these areas. If you don't think the government has any responsibility for doing some of these things, please tell me. For example, "trying to even out the differences between the rich and the poor classes in Mexico." Would you say that the government is doing very well, not so well, or poorly in fulfilling its responsibility?
- 171a. Do you think that most people in Mexico are getting their fair share or less than their fair share of the good things in life -- that is, the things that are needed to live happily and comfortably? Much less or only a little less?

(7) Sense of Openness in Society:

- 41a. Do you think it is more difficult for a provinciano [migrant] to get ahead in this city than for someone born and raised here, or don't you think it makes any difference?

55. In your opinion, what is the best occupation that a person of your ability and experience can hope for?
63. It has been said that if a man works hard, saves his money, and is ambitious, he will get ahead in life. How often do you think this really happens?
- 73a. If the son of a working man is intelligent and hard-working, how much opportunity does he have of becoming the owner of a small business, if he really tries?
- 73b. How much opportunity does he have of becoming the owner of a large business?
- 73c. How much opportunity does he have of becoming a high-ranking public official?
- 73d. How much opportunity does he have of becoming a high-ranking military officer?
- 73e. How much opportunity does he have of becoming an important politician?
- 73f. How much opportunity does he have of becoming an office worker [empleado]?
- 73g. How much opportunity does he have of becoming a doctor?
74. What do you think is the most important thing one needs in order to get ahead in life?
- 86b. How difficult do you think it is to move from a lower social class to a higher one? Would you say it is very difficult or almost impossible, somewhat difficult, not very difficult, or not difficult at all?

(8) Aspirations for Children's Mobility:

Composite index constructed from scores on indexes of aspirations for children's educational attainment and aspirations for children's occupation.

(FROM TABLE 2)

(9) Disposition to Work Collectively in Problem-Solving and Need Satisfaction:

- 60f. Here are some questions about different aspects of life and work. Each question has two parts, or statements. For each question, we want to know which part you believe is more true. In some cases you may believe that both parts are true. In other cases you may think neither part is true. But for every question, we want you to choose the part which you believe is more true. For example:
- (1) The best job to have is one where you are part of a group all working together.
- (2) It is better to work alone and achieve your own goals than to work with other people and have to depend on them.
61. Some people say that a man should work for his goals in life participating with others as a member of organized groups, while others think it is best to work for one's goals by acting alone, without belonging to organized groups. How do you feel about it? Is it better to work for one's goals by working with others as a member of a group, or is it better to work alone?

144. In general, which do you think would be more helpful to you and your family in improving your living situation: Working with other families in the colonia for common goals and improvements, or trying to get individual benefits or favors through someone like a friend with "influence", an employer, or a political leader?

(10) Trust in People:

66. Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?
- 126a. When you meet someone for the first time in this colonia, should you:  
-- Trust him until he proves to be unworthy of that trust?  
-- Be cautious about trusting him until you know him better? (or)  
-- Not trust him because he may take advantage of you?
- 127a. Some people are inclined to help others. Other people are more inclined to look out only for themselves. Thinking again about the people in this colonia, which of the following statements do you think applies most to them?  
-- Most people around here are helpful to the others  
-- Most people around here look out only for themselves

(11) Tolerance for Dissent and Opposition:

- 60b. Which statement do you believe is more true?  
(1) People with wild and strange opinions should not be allowed to speak in public in this country.  
(2) Anyone with something to say should be allowed to speak out, regardless of what ideas or point of view he may have.
- 60g. Which statement do you believe is more true?  
(1) Listening to all the different points of view on something is very confusing; it's better to hear just one point of view from somebody who is informed.  
(2) Before making a decision, it's good to consider the opinions of as many different people as possible.
123. Suppose two men are talking about some problem of this colonia, and of the best way of solving it. The first man says: "It is better for each person to form his own opinion of what should be done and to defend his point of view before his neighbors. If there are large differences of opinion among the residents of the colonia, then the matter should be decided by taking a vote." The second man says: "As soon as you begin deciding questions like that by taking a vote, you'll see that some people are with you and some are against you, and in that way divisions and quarrels develop. It's best to get everybody to agree first, then you don't have to vote." With which one of these two men are you most in agreement?
- 177j. In your opinion, which is the better leader?  
-- The man who makes decisions without permitting discussion on the part of the members of the group, or  
-- The man who makes decisions only after listening to the discussions of members of the group

(12) Protest Orientation:

- 129e. During the student demonstrations in Mexico City in August and September of 1968 -- that is, at the time of the Olympic Games -- were you on the side of the government or of the students?
- 129f. What were your feelings about what happened -- especially about the government's actions toward the students? For example, did you feel that the actions taken by the government were justified or not? Why do you say that?
- 129h. Can you imagine any kind of situation in which you might take part in demonstrations like the ones in Mexico City in 1968? What kind of situation? Could you give me an example of what you mean?
145. Now I would like to know how right or wrong you think different kinds of actions are. For example, most people think that something like murder is very wrong, while something like bragging may be considered only a little bit wrong or not wrong at all. Here are some other examples: -- A man joins in a protest march or demonstration to get public officials to correct an unjust situation. Would you say that this is not wrong, that it is a little bit wrong, or that it is very wrong?
- 176j. Suppose a group of people in this city strongly feels that the government is treating them unfairly. I'm going to read a list of some things these people might do to try to get the government to change the situation. Which do you think would be the most effective way? [Coded for selection of protest strategy.]
- 176k. Have you ever become so angry about some public issue or problem that you really wanted to do something about it?
- 176n. Have you ever joined in sending a protest message or complaint to some public official about a problem which concerned you greatly?
- 176o. Have you ever gone with a group of people to protest or complain to a public official about some problem?
- 176p. Have you ever attended a protest meeting or demonstration about some problem which concerned you greatly?
- 177f. Suppose this group [community improvement organization] made a decision which you did not like. Would you feel free to protest, would you feel uneasy about protesting, or do you think it would be better not to protest?

(13) Pessimism:

- 60c. Which statement do you believe is more true?  
(1) You sometimes can't help wondering whether life is worthwhile any more.  
(2) Life is often hard and unfair, but one must always make the best of what he has.
- 60p. (1) It's hardly fair to bring a child into the world, the way things look for the future.  
(2) No matter how bad things may look at times, we should always have hope for what the future may bring.

- 60x. (1) Everything is so uncertain these days that it almost seems as though anything could happen.  
(2) In spite of everything, it's really not hard for a person to know where he stands from one day to the next.
- 193b. In general, how would you say you feel most of the time -- in good spirits or in low spirits?

(FROM TABLE 3)

(14) Sense of Insecurity of Land Tenure:

- 105a. What about your present situation...do you feel that your claim to your house and land is secure?
- 131a. In your opinion, what are the most urgent or serious problems and needs of this colonia? [Coded for mention of insecurity of land tenure.]
- 143a. Thinking again about the problems and needs of this colonia....Are you now, or have you been in the last year or so, personally concerned about such problems? Any particular kind of problem? [Coded for mention of insecurity of land tenure.]

(15) Knowledge of Community:

87. Now I would like you to think for a while about the colonia in which you live. Here is a piece of paper. Could you draw me a rough map of this colonia, showing where it begins and where it ends? I don't need anything detailed, just a rough sketch showing the boundaries of the colonia. [Coded for ability to draw map corresponding to legally or informally recognized boundaries of colonia.]
- 112a. When you think about this colonia, in what ways do you think it has changed since you arrived here? Could you tell me the two or three most important changes that have taken place?
- 122a. In your opinion, who are the three persons who have the most influence in this colonia? That is, the persons who are most successful in getting their own way and getting things done. What kind of work do they do?
109. In general, how much movement of families in and out of the colonia would you say there is? Would you say that there is a great deal of such movement, some movement, not very much, or hardly any?
- 131a. Think now about the most important needs and problems of [colonia in which respondent lives]. In your opinion, what are the most urgent or serious problems and needs of this colonia?
- 177a. Do you know of any group or organization of residents which concerns itself with the needs and problems of this colonia in particular? What is the name of this group or organization?

(16) Psychological Integration into the Community:

- 89a. At the present time, do you feel yourself to be a part of the colonia and are settled in it? Do you feel that you "belong" and are really established in this colonia?

90. Do you think you have a great deal in common with the other people living in this colonia, quite a bit in common, little in common, or nothing in common with them?
- 60k. Which statement do you believe is more true?  
(1) I usually feel that I'm very much a part of the things going on around here.  
(2) These days I get a feeling that I'm just not a part of things.
- 113a. Can you recall any event, incident, or experience that may have occurred in this colonia since you have lived here...something that you considered very important or something about which you felt very strongly? Something that made you really angry or really happy?
- 143a. Thinking again about the problems and needs of [colonia in which respondent lives], which we were discussing before....Are you now, or have you been in the last year or so, personally concerned about such problems?
1761. Have you ever become so angry about some public issue or problem that you really wanted to do something about it? What kind of problem were you concerned about? [Coded for mention of community problem.]

(17) Social Integration into the Community:

- 116a. Now I would like to ask a few questions about the people who live in this colonia. Do you have many friends in this colonia? For example, would you say that your neighbors are your friends? All your neighbors, some of them, or none of them?
117. About how many people in this colonia do you know well enough to talk to?
- 118a. Now think about your three closest neighbors -- those whom you know best. How often do you get together with them?
- 118b. Now think about your three closest friends. In what area or areas do they live? How often do you get together with them?
- 118d. Think now of your three closest relatives, other than those who live with you in this house. In what area or areas do they live? How often do you get together with them?
- 119a. Are you or any members of your family related to any other persons living in this colonia through compadrazgo [ritual coparenthood of baptism, or godparenthood]? To how many persons?
- 130a. Here is another kind of question. Suppose something were to happen to your family -- say, for example, a case of serious illness or accident, the sudden loss of your job or of your house, etc. Is there some person or group or office which you could rely upon for help in such a situation? Does this person live (is this group or office located) inside or outside of [colonia in which respondent lives]?
- 115b. Suppose you heard a rumor that the government was going to build a new health center for the people living in this colonia and others nearby. To what person or group or office would you go to get more information about such a matter? Does this person live (is this group, office located) inside or outside of [colonia in which respondent lives]?

143b. Do you ever discuss [community problems and needs] with other people in this colonia? How often?

(18) Perception of Community Solidarity:

120a. Do you think that the people who live in this colonia are very united, more or less united, only a little united, or not united at all?

131c. Are many of the other people in this colonia concerned about [community problems and needs], or are most of them unconcerned?

(19) Perceived Quality of Social Relations in Community:

116b. Why do you feel that [some or all of] your neighbors are your friends?

128a. Do your neighbors sometimes quarrel or argue with you? How often does this happen?

128b. Do you think that there is more or less quarreling among neighbors here than in [respondent's place of origin]?

121a. In many places there are groups that are opposed to each other. Thinking about [colonia in which respondent lives], what are the major groups that oppose each other here? That is, the groups that have differences of opinion or who have controversies. [coded for mention of conflict groups.]

124. Do you think that most people around here tend to be hard on a person who does not agree with his neighbors on something like politics? Or do you think it does not matter with most people?

126a. When you meet someone for the first time in this colonia, should you:  
-- Trust him until he proves to be unworthy of that trust?  
-- Be cautious about trusting him until you know him better? (or)  
-- Not trust him because he may take advantage of you?

127a. Some people are inclined to help others. Other people are more inclined to look out only for themselves. Thinking again about the people in this colonia, which of the following statements do you think applies most to them?  
-- Most people around here are helpful to the others.  
-- Most people around here look out only for themselves.

(20) Sense of Community Progress:

108. Do you think this colonia is progressing? Would you say it is progressing rapidly, progressing slowly, that it is not progressing, or that it is getting worse?

114a. Think about the changes that may take place in this colonia in the next five years or so. What do you think the colonia will be like five years from now? In what ways do you think it will be different from its present condition?

114c. Here is a set of photographs. Which one of these looks most like what you think this colonia will look like five years or so from now?

(21) Overall Community Affect:

Composite index constructed from scores on indexes of perceived quality of social relations, sense of community progress, satisfaction with residential environment, and perceived solidarity of community.

(22) Positive Evaluation of Community Leadership:

- 112g. Who do you think was most responsible for [changes respondent has observed in the community since arrival there]?
- 130a. Suppose something were to happen to your family -- say, for example, a case of serious illness or accident, the sudden loss of your job or of your house, etc. Is there some person or group or office which you could rely upon for help in such a situation? [Coded for mention of community leader.]
- 131e. Within this colonia, who may be able to help in solving these [community problems]? [Coded for mention of community leader.]
- 177i. How would you rate the leaders of this colonia? Would you say they are very able or competent, more or less able, not very able, or very incompetent?
- 177k. Suppose we talk with other residents of this colonia....How much attention should we pay to what the common man says as against what the leaders of the colonia tell us?

(23) Satisfaction with Residential Environment:

- 107a. In general, how would you rate this colonia as a place to live?
- 107c. What is it in particular that you don't like about living here? [Coded for mention of source of dissatisfaction.]
110. Do you think that in relation to the rest of Mexico City this colonia is very isolated, more or less isolated, not very isolated, or not isolated at all?
- 11a. As far as you know now, do you intend to stay here permanently, or do you intend to move within the foreseeable future?

(24) Disposition to Conform to Community Norms:

124. Do you think that most people around here tend to be hard on a person who does not agree with his neighbors on something like politics? Or do you think it does not matter with most people?
- 125a. Some people feel that when they are troubled by a problem of the colonia, they can do something about it, such as speak out for or against a solution to the problem, or in some other way attempt to get their opinions considered. Other people feel that this kind of activity can only lead to problems for them. We would like to know your feelings about such matters. Suppose some problem of the colonia comes up, and you are troubled by it, and you decide to do something about it. Would any of the following things be likely to happen?  
-- Your friends and neighbors would disapprove of your efforts.  
-- You would get a warning from the leaders of the colonia.  
If any of these things actually happened to you because you were trying to do something about a problem of the community, what would you do then? Would you continue trying to do something about the problem or would you stop trying?

- 160c. Suppose you were a supporter of some political party or candidate for public office, but most people in this colonia favored another party or candidate. What do you think the supporters of the other candidate or party would do to you? How would they act toward you? [If respondent anticipates some negative action or behavior toward himself in response to the above:] What would you do then? Would you decide to support the party or candidate favored by most of your neighbors, or would you go on supporting the party or candidate that you preferred?
- 177f. Suppose this group [community improvement organization] made a decision which you did not like. Would you feel free to protest, would you feel uneasy about protesting, or do you think it would be better not to protest?

(FROM TABLE 4)

(25) Political System Affect:

135. What political party do you think contributes the most to solving the problems of this colonia?
- 159a. Now we would like to know something about your opinions of some political parties. Is there any political party in this country that you think would do more good for the people of the country than any of the others?
172. Some people say that, in general, our system of government and politics is good for the country; others feel it is bad for the country. How do you feel about this? Do you think that, in general, the present system of government and politics is good for the country or bad for the country?

(26) Political Cynicism:

- 60w. Which statement do you believe is more true?  
(1) It's good to pay attention to election campaigns because it is important that the best candidate wins.  
(2) It doesn't matter much whether the people elect one candidate or another, because nothing is going to change, anyway.
- 154d. Would you say that the newspapers (radio, television) from which you get your news and information are usually correct and trustworthy, or are they not very correct and trustworthy?
163. Some people say that it is useless to vote in elections because those who will govern have already been selected by the PRI. Do you think this is true or not?
164. Do you think that the majority of public officials in this country are trying to help the people in general, or are they trying mostly to advance their own personal interests or careers?
166. Which of these statements do you think is most true?  
-- However good the politicians sound in their speeches, you can never tell what they will do once elected.  
-- Most politicians who are elected try to do what they promised to do.
167. What do you think causes a man to become a politician -- that is, to have a political career?
168. Would you say that dishonesty and corruption are more prevalent in the government service than in most other careers, less prevalent, or about the same?

(27) Trust in Government:

- 158b. How much do you think you can trust the federal government to do what is right? Would you say that you can trust the federal government almost always, most of the time, sometimes, or almost never?
- 158d. How much do you think you can trust the [municipal government] to do what is right?
- 173a. Thinking now about the government now in power, that of Díaz Ordaz: Do you believe that this government would ever pass some law or take some kind of action that would be harmful to people like yourself? How likely is it that this would ever occur? Would you say it is very likely, somewhat likely, or not at all likely?
- 173b. And how about the government for the new sexenio [six year period of government]? For example, that of Luís Echeverría, if he is elected to the presidency. Do you think that this government would ever pass some law or take some action that would be harmful to people like yourself? How likely is it that this might happen? Would you say it is very likely, somewhat likely, or not at all likely?

(28) Positive Evaluation of Political Authority Performance:

134. Here is a ladder. Suppose the group or person who contributes most to the welfare of the people around here -- that is, the person or group which acts most strongly in the interests of you and other residents of this colonia -- is at the top of the ladder; and the group or person who does the least or does nothing for the welfare of the people around here is at the bottom. Where would the following people or groups be in terms of their contribution to the welfare of the people around here? Near the group or person who contributes most, or near the one who contributes least to your welfare?
- The President of the Republic
  - Politicians
  - The head of the Department of the Federal District (mayor of Mexico City), Corona del Rosal
  - The head of the Office of Colonias, Félix Ramírez
- 174c. In terms of their overall performance as President of the Republic -- that is, the kind of job they did while in office -- how would you rate each of these men:
- Miguel Alemán
  - Adolfo López Mateos
  - Gustavo Díaz Ordaz
- 174d. How would you rate Carlos Madrazo as a political leader -- very good, good, average, not very good, or poor?

(29) Perception of Governmental Concern for the Poor:

172. [Regarding respondent's belief as to whether the present system of government and politics is good or bad for the country:] Why do you feel that way? [Coded for mention of official concern for the poor.]
- 68b. [If the respondent believes there is not much injustice in the country:] Why do you feel that way? Could you give me an example of what you mean? [Coded for mention of government help for the poor.]
- 158e. How much interest do you think the [municipal government] takes in this colonia?

167. What do you think causes a man to become a politician -- that is, to have a political career? [Coded for mention of concern for helping the poor.]
- 141a. Now I am going to read a list of activities. As I read each type of activity, I would like you to give me your opinion of how well the government is doing in each of these areas. If you don't think the government has any responsibility for doing some of these things, please tell me. For example, "providing decent housing for the poor." Would you say that the government is doing very well, not so well, or poorly in fulfilling its responsibility for providing decent housing for the poor?
- Providing medical care for the poor
  - Trying to even out the differences between the rich and the poor classes in Mexico
  - Providing economic help (that is, credit, loans, pension benefits, and other kinds of benefits to those in need )
- 161f. [If respondent's party preference in 1964 and/or 1970 was P.R.I., the official party:] Could you tell me the main reason why you have always supported the P.R.I.? [Coded for mention of help for the poor.]

(30) Pro Socio-Political Change Orientation:

70. Would you tell me with which of the following three statements you agree most?
- (1) The government should not intervene in the economic life of the country, but should leave economic questions in the hands of private citizens.
  - (2) The government should not own businesses but should control some aspects of their operation.
  - (3) The government should own all businesses and industries and should control the entire economic life of the country.
- 171e. In your opinion, what is it Mexico needs most? A total and immediate change, a total but gradual change, a partial and immediate change, or no change at all?
172. Some people say that, in general, our system of government and politics is good for the country; others feel it is bad for the country. How do you feel about this? Do you think that, in general, the present system of government and politics is good for the country or bad for the country?
- 171b. [If respondent feels that most people in Mexico are getting much less or a little less than their fair share of the good things in life:] What should be done in order to see that most people get their fair share?

(31) Support for Official Party:

- 159a. Now we would like to know something about your opinions of some political parties. Is there any political party in this country that you think would do more good for the people of the country than any of the others?

- 159c. Are you currently a member of some political party?
- 159d. [If response to previous question is negative:] Do you consider yourself a supporter of some particular political party?
- 159e. [If response to previous question is negative:] If you had to choose, is there any party that you might prefer?

(32) Overall Political System Support:

Composite index constructed from scores on indexes of political system affect, trust in government, political cynicism, symbolic commitment to the political system, functional commitment to the political system, positive evaluation of political authority performance, extent of dissatisfaction with government outputs, intensity of dissatisfaction with government outputs, evaluation of police performance, and perceptions of government responsiveness.

(FROM TABLE 5)

(33) Civic-Mindedness:

152. What do you think a person ought to do in order to be a good Mexican?  
[Coded for mention of "civic duty" activities.]
- 161g. Which of these statements best describes how you feel when you go to vote?  
-- I take pleasure in doing this.  
-- I am only complying with my duty.  
-- I feel bothered -- it's a waste of time.  
-- I don't feel anything in particular.
- 177e. To what extent do you feel you are obligated to participate in the meetings and activities of this group [community improvement organization]?

(34) Self-Help Orientation:

- 131d. When you think of [community] problems of the sort you have mentioned, do you believe they can be solved by those living within the colonia, or would help be needed from outside the colonia?
- 143c. Have you ever worked or cooperated with other residents of [colonia in which respondent lives] to try to solve some problem or meet some need of the colonia?
- 171b. [If respondent feels that most people in Mexico are getting much less or a little less than their fair share of the good things in life:] What should be done in order to see that most people get their fair share? [Coded for mention of self-help efforts.]

(35) Subjective Political Competence:

- 60d. Which of these statements do you believe is more true?  
(1) In the long run, we ourselves are responsible for having bad government.  
(2) Someone like me doesn't have any say about what the government does.

- 60m. Which of these statements do you believe is more true?  
(1) Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.  
(2) If a person just pays attention to what is going on in politics and government, he should be able to understand what is happening.
142. Some people say that one can only wait and accept government programs; others feel that a person can have influence on the government and make the government help people. How do you feel about this? Do you think that one can only wait and accept government programs, or do you think a person can have influence and make the government help?
165. In your opinion, how much attention do the leaders of this country-- that is, the really powerful public officials and politicians -- pay to the opinions of the ordinary man like yourself? Would you say that they pay a great deal of attention, some attention, only a little attention, or no attention at all?
170. Do you think that the way people vote in elections has some effect on what the government does? Would you say it has a lot of effect, only a little effect or no effect at all?

(36) Perceived Dependency on Government:

- 131b. Who or what is responsible for most of the [community] problems you have mentioned?
132. Generally speaking, which is most important for improving the conditions of life in this colonia: the hard work of the residents, God's help, the government's help, or good luck?
- 171b. [If respondent believes that most people in Mexico are getting much less or a little less than their fair share of the good things in life:] What should be done in order to see that most people get their fair share? [Coded for mention of government action.]
- 171d. [If respondent believes that he is getting much less or a little less than his fair share of the good things in life:] Who or what would you say is principally to blame for your not getting your fair share? [Coded for mention of government.]

(FROM TABLE 6)

(37) Overall Political Awareness:

Composite index constructed from scores on indexes of perceived relevance of government, political knowledge, interest in politics and government, political opinion-holding, discussion of politics, partisanship, attentiveness to political stimuli, and range of perceived needs and problems.

(38) Perceived Relevance of Government and Politics to Need Satisfaction:

- 130a. Suppose something were to happen to your family -- say, for example, a case of serious illness or accident, the sudden loss of your job or of your house, etc. Is there some person or group or office which you could rely upon for help in such a situation? [Coded for mention of political or governmental agency.]

- 131b. Who is responsible for most of the [community] problems which you have mentioned?
- 131c. Within this colonia, who may be able to help in solving these kinds of problems? [Coded for mention of political or governmental office.]
- 131i. And who is it from outside of this colonia who may be able to help in solving the kinds of problems you have mentioned?
132. Generally speaking, which is most important for improving the conditions of life in this colonia? The hard work of the residents, God's help, the government's help, or good luck?
- 158a. Thinking now again about the federal government -- that is, the government of the President, of the Federal Congress, and all the other federal agencies: How much effect do its activities have on your life from day to day?
- 158c. Thinking now about the [municipal government]: How much effect do its activities have on your life from day to day?
- 158e. How much interest do you think the [municipal government] takes in this colonia?
- 171b. [If respondent feels that most people in Mexico are not getting their fair share of the good things in life:] What should be done in order that most people get their fair share? [Coded for mention of governmental action.]
- 171d. [If respondent feels that he is not getting his fair share of the good things in life:] Who or what would you say is responsible for your not getting your fair share?

(39) Political Opinion-Holding:

- 56b. [If respondent is aware of the new Federal Labor Law:] Do you think that this law will have any effect on your own job, in particular? In what ways?
70. Would you tell me with which of the following three statements you agree most?
- (1) The government should not intervene in the economic life of the country, but should leave economic questions in the hands of private citizens.
  - (2) The government should not own businesses but should control some aspects of their operation.
  - (3) The government should own all businesses and industries and should control the entire economic life of the country.
- 129e. During the student demonstrations in Mexico City in August and September of 1968 -- that is, at the time of the Olympic Games -- were you on the side of the government or of the students?

(40) Political Knowledge:

- 56a. Can you tell me anything about the new Federal Labor Law? For example, what kinds of things it is supposed to gain for the workers?
- 131a. In your opinion, what are the most urgent or serious problems and needs of this colonia?

147. Think now about the problems of Mexico. In your opinion, what are the most important problems in the country?
- 122a. In your opinion, who are the three persons who have the most influence in [colonia in which respondent lives]? That is, the persons who are most successful in getting their own way and getting things done? What kind of work do they do?
- 156a. We are also interested in knowing how well known are various public officials. Can you tell me the name of the President of the Republic?
- 156b. Can you tell me the name of the candidate of the P.R.I. [official party] for President of the Republic in the current election campaign?
- 156c. Can you tell me the name of the congressman who represents your district in the federal congress?
148. What do you think are the most important things that make Mexico different from other countries?
- 157b. Do you know if there are any workers, organizers or leaders of a political party here in [colonia in which respondent lives]? Can you tell me their names and for what party they work?
- 157d. During the current election campaign, what kinds of things have the political parties done to try to win the support of the people in this colonia for their candidates?
- 162e. Where do people vote around here? Where is the nearest polling place?
- 162c. Can you tell me the names of any of the persons who are currently running for congressman in your district?
- 174d. Could you tell me who Carlos Madrazo [dissident political leader] was?
- 137a. Have you ever heard of the C. N. O. P. [official party organ]?
- 138a. Have you ever heard of the C. C. I. [agrarian political confederation]?
- 136b. Where is the nearest office of the P.R.I.? In what colonia and on what street is it located?

(41) Perception of Governmental Outputs:

- 112c. Who do you think was most responsible for these changes [in the community, observed by respondent]?
- 158e. [Regarding amount of interest the respondent believes the municipal government takes in his colonia:] Why do you feel this way? [Coded for mention of governmental actions, programs, etc.]

(42) Overall Political Participation:

Composite index constructed from scores on indexes of voting participation, campaign involvement, particularized contacting of officials, and communal contacting of officials.

(43) Voting Participation:

- 161a. Do you try to vote in every national election (that is, elections for President of the Republic, or Congressman in the federal congress), do you sometimes miss an election, or do you rarely vote in such elections?

- 161b. Would you tell me for which party or presidential candidate you voted in the last national election? [Coded for voting in election.]
- 161c. Would you tell me for which party or presidential candidate you intend to vote in the next national election? [Coded for intention to vote in election.]

(44) Campaign Involvement:

- 157f. During an election campaign has any political party worker or organizer ever contacted you to ask your support or cooperation in some way? In what way? How did you respond?
- 175e. In the last six months, did you:  
-- Attend a political meeting or rally, perhaps a rally held in connection with the current election campaign?  
-- Do anything to help people get registered to vote?
- 175f. Have you ever done anything during an election campaign to help elect some candidate? In what ways did you help? About how many times have you done that?

(45) Particularistic Contacting of Officials:\*

- 136c. [If respondent can locate an office of the P.R.I.:] Have you ever gone there? For what purpose?
- 176a. [If respondent has contacted some official of the municipal government:] What kind of problem or need were you concerned about?
- 176m. [If respondent ever became greatly concerned about some public issue or problem:] Did you do anything about it? What?

(\*Items in this index were coded for mention of individually-initiated contacts regarding personal or family needs.)

(46) Communal Contacting of Officials:\*

- 136c. [If respondent can locate an office of the P.R.I.:] Have you ever gone there? For what purpose?
- 143c. [If respondent has ever worked or cooperated with other residents of his colonia to try to solve a community problem:] What did you try to do about it?
- 176a. [If respondent has contacted some official of the municipal government:] What kind of problem or need were you concerned about?
- 176m. [If respondent ever became greatly concerned about some public issue or problem:] Did you do anything about it? What?
- 176n. Have you ever joined in sending a protest message or complaint to some public official about a problem which concerned you greatly?
- 176o. Have you ever gone with a group of people to protest or complain to a public official about some problem?

(\*Items in this index were coded for mention of collectively-initiated contacts concerning community needs.)

(47) Participation in Community Problem-Solving Activity:

- 120b. What kinds of work have you done together with other residents of this colonia? Have you taken part in any of these activities [see below]? How many times have you done this?
- Building a meeting hall, school, or other structure for use of the community in general.
  - Installation of public services (electricity, water or sewage system, etc.)
  - Providing assistance to families affected by floods, fires, or other disasters
  - Helping to provide security or protection for the colonia (including fire protection)
  - Other types of community development or welfare activities
- 133a. Have you made donations to the leaders of this colonia, or to other persons or groups within the colonia, for some purpose? To whom have you made these donations? For what purposes?
- 143c. Have you ever worked or cooperated with other residents of [colonia in which respondent lives] to try to solve some problem or meet some need of the colonia? When was this?

(48) Membership in Politically Relevant Organizations:

- 159c. Are you currently a member of some political party?
- 177b. During the past six months, did you participate in any of the activities of [a community improvement organization]? In what ways did you participate? Did you attend meetings of the group, give money, participate in work projects of the group, or did you participate in some other way?
182. Are you a member of any other group or organization that is interested in politics or public affairs?

(49) Discussion of Politics and Public Affairs:

- 175a. In general, how often do you discuss politics and public affairs with other persons?
- 175c. Do you discuss politics and public affairs in the period between elections or just at election time?
- 175b. [If respondent discusses politics and public affairs with other persons:] With whom do you discuss these matters? [Coded for number of types of discussants -- relatives, friends, neighbors, co-workers, etc.]

(FROM TABLE 8)

(50) Overall Socioeconomic Status:

- 43a. Could you tell me something about your main occupation? -- What do you do for a living? In this job, do you work for an employer or boss, or are you an owner or business partner?
185. Using this card, I would like you to show me which of these groups, from "A" to "I," comes closest to the total amount of the income of the members of your family, including the income from all sources, such as wages, rent, or any other source.

- 192b. How far did you get with your education? What was the last year of school that you completed?
195. [Respondent's socio-economic level, by interviewer observation: lower class, lower-middle class, middle class, upper class.]

(51) Overall Psychological Involvement in Politics:

Composite index constructed from scores on indexes of interest in politics, discussion of politics, and attention to political stimuli in campaigns and mass media.

(FROM TABLE 10)

(52) Perceived Salience of Community Leadership:

- 115a. Suppose you heard a rumor that the government was going to build a new health center for the people living in this colonia and others nearby. To what person or group or office would you go to get more information about such a matter? [Coded for mention of community leader.]
- 122a. In your opinion, who are the three persons who have the most influence in [colonia in which respondent lives]? That is, the persons who are most successful in getting their own way and getting things done. [Coded for number of leaders identified.]
- 177i. How would you rate the leaders of this colonia? Would you say they are very able or competent, more or less able, not very able, or very incompetent? [Coded for ability to make such an evaluation.]

(FROM TABLE 11)

(53) Exposure to Collective Stress Situations:

95. Has your house ever been flooded?
- 96a. And the land...how did you obtain it? [Coded for participation in land invasion.]
- 102a. Do you know of any attempts by the government or the police to evict or tear down the houses of any residents in this colonia? [If yes:] Were you living in the colonia when this occurred?
- 102i. Can you recall any other incidents of this nature? How many? Did these things also happen here in this colonia, or somewhere else?
- 103a. Do you know if there have been any actions of this kind taken by private landowners or subdividers in this colonia? -- That is, sudden evictions, destruction of houses, and other kinds of abuses? [If yes:] Were you living in the colonia when this occurred?
- 103i. Can you recall any other incidents of this nature, that happened in this colonia?
- 118a-g. Can you recall any event, incident, or experience that may have occurred in this colonia since you have lived here...something that you considered very important or something about which you felt very strongly? What happened? How did it come about?

(54) Religiosity:

62. Now I'm going to read a list of things that a young man may need to learn in life. Would you please tell me which one of these you think is most important?  
-- Knowing how to do his job well  
-- Being a good father and head of the family  
-- Being a good Mexican  
-- Making a good income  
-- Being a good friend  
-- Practicing his religion faithfully  
-- Helping his fellow man
132. Generally speaking, which is most important for improving the conditions of life in this colonia: the hard work of the residents, God's help, the government's help, or good luck?
134. Here is a ladder. Suppose the group or person who contributes most to the welfare of the people around here -- that is, the person or group which acts most strongly in the interests of you and other residents of this colonia -- is at the top of the ladder; and the group or person who does the least or does nothing for the welfare of the people around here is at the bottom. Where would priests be in terms of their contribution to the welfare of the people around here? -- Near the group or person who contributes most or near the one who contributes least to your welfare?
169. Many people say that some groups have too much power and influence in this country and that other groups have too little power and influence. I'm going to read a list of groups. Please tell me for each of these groups whether you think they should have more power and influence or less power and influence than they have now in politics and public affairs.  
-- Priests (The Church)
- 188b. During the last three months, how often did you go to mass (church, synagogue)? -- That is, how many times did you go each month?
- 188d. How important would you say religion is in your life today?

REFERENCES

- Altschuler, Alan. 1970. Community Control. New York: Pegasus.
- Andrews, Frank M., and George W. Phillips. 1970. "The Squatters of Lima: Who They Are and What They Want," Journal of Developing Areas, vol. 4 (January), pp. 211-224.
- Aubert, Vilhelm, Burton R. Fisher, and Stein Rokkan. 1954. "A Comparative Study of Teachers' Attitudes to International Problems and Policies," Journal of Social Issues, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 25-39.
- Barresi, Charles M., and John H. Lindquist. 1970. "The Urban Community: Attitudes Toward Neighborhood and Urban Renewal," Urban Affairs Quarterly, vol. 5, no. 3 (March), pp. 278-290.
- Barton, Allen H. 1968. "Bringing Society Back In," American Behavioral Scientist, vol. 12, pp. 1-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. Communities in Disaster: A Sociological Analysis of Collective Stress Situations. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday-Anchor Books.
- Behrman, Lucy C. 1971. The Convergence of Religious and Political Attitudes and Activities Among Workers in Santiago, Chile (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. "Political Development and Secularization in Two Chilean Communities," Comparative Politics, vol. 4, no. 2 (January), pp. 269-280.
- Bell, Wendell. 1965. "Urban Neighborhoods and Individual Behavior," in Muzafer Sherif and Carolyn W. Sherif (eds.), Problems of Youth. Chicago: Aldine, pp. 235-264.
- Bell, Wendell, and Maryanne T. Force. 1956. "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review, vol. 21 (February), pp. 25-34.
- Berelson, Bernard R., et al. 1954. Voting. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blalock, H. M. 1967. "Status Inconsistency, Social Mobility, Status Integration, and Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, vol. 32 (October), pp. 790-801.

- Blau, Peter M. 1960. "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, vol. 25 (April), pp. 178-193.
- Brim, Orville G., Jr. 1965. "Socialization Through the Life Cycle," in Orville G. Brim and Stanton Wheeler (eds.), Socialization After Childhood. New York: Wiley.
- Brody, Eugene (ed.). 1970. Behavior in New Environments: Adaptation of Migrant Populations. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Butterworth, Douglas. 1971. Squatter Settlements in the City of Oaxaca: The Structure of Diversity (paper prepared for the Program on Modernization and Urbanization Problems in Latin America, University of Illinois, Urbana, March).
- Calderon Alvarado, Luis. 1963. Poder retentivo del 'Área local urbana' en las relaciones sociales. Fribourg, Switzerland: Centro Internacional de Investigaciones Sociales de la Fédération Européenne de Recherche Économique et Social.
- Campbell, Angus. 1958. "The Political Implications of Community Identification," in Roland Young (ed.), Approaches to the Study of Politics. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, pp. 318-328.
- Campbell, Ernest Q., and C. Norman Alexander. 1965. "Structural Effects and Interpersonal Relationships," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 71, no. 3 (November), pp. 284-289.
- Coleman, James S. 1958-59. "Relational Analysis: The Study of Social Organization with Survey Methods," Human Organization, vol. 17, pp. 28-36.
- Collier, David. 1971. Squatter Settlement Formation and the Politics of Cooptation in Peru (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago).
- Cooley, Charles H. 1962 (original publication 1909). Social Organization. New York: Schocken Books.
- Cornelius, Wayne A. 1972a. "Local-level Political Leadership in Low-Income Urban Environments: A Structural Analysis of Urban Caciquismo in Mexico," Urban Anthropology, vol. 1, no. 2 (forthcoming, Fall).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972b. Political Behavior in Urban Mexico: The Politics of Migrant Assimilation in Low-Income Urban Environments (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972c. "The Cityward Movement: Some Political Implications," in Douglas Chalmers (ed.), Changing Latin America: New Interpretations of its Society and Politics. New York: Academy of Political Science, Columbia University.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "The Process of Politicization among Cityward Migrants," in Everett E. Hagen (ed.), Recent Research on Rural-Urban Migration. Cambridge: MIT Press, forthcoming.
- Cornelius, Wayne A., Henry Dietz, and James W. White. 1972. Policy Implications of Population Movement: A Cross-Cultural Study of Politicization and Demand-Making Behavior Among Low-Income Migrants to Large Cities. Research proposal to the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations Program of Social Science and Legal Research on Population Policy. Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, February.
- Cox, Kevin R. 1969. "The Spatial Structuring of Information Flow and Partisan Attitudes," in Mattei Dogan and Stein Rokkan (eds.), Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp. 157-185.
- Davies, J. Clarence, III. 1966. Neighborhood Groups and Urban Renewal. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Davis, James A. 1962. Great Books and Small Groups. New York: Free Press.
- Davis, James A., Joe L. Spaeth, and Carolyn Huson. 1961. "A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Composition," American Sociological Review, vol. 26, no. 2 (April), pp. 215-225.
- Dietz, Henry. 1972. The Politics of Squatter Assimilation in Lima, Peru (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University).
- Eckstein, Susan. 1972a. The Poverty of Revolution: A Study of Social, Economic, and Political Inequality in a Central City Area, A Squatter Settlement, and a Low Cost Housing Project in Mexico City (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972b. Ideological and Intellectual Biases in the Study of Latin American Urban Poverty (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, New Orleans, September).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. "Politics and the Informal Web of Political Involvements in Three Lower Class Sections of Mexico City," in Everett E. Hagen (ed.), Recent Research on Rural-Urban Migration. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, forthcoming.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. 1965. Essays on Comparative Institutions. New York: Wiley.
- Ennis, Philip H. 1962. "The Contextual Dimension in Voting," in William N. McPhee and William A. Glaser (eds.), Public Opinion and Congressional Elections. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, pp. 180-211.
- Eulau, Heinz. 1969. Micro-Macro Political Analysis. Chicago: Aldine.

- Fellin, Phillip, and Eugene Litwak. 1968. "The Neighborhood in Urban American Society," Social Work, vol. 13 (July), pp. 72-80.
- Festinger, Leon S., S. Schachter, and Kurt Back. 1950. Social Pressures in Informal Groups. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Flinn, William L. 1970. "Influence of Community Values on Innovativeness," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 75, no. 6 (May), pp. 983-991.
- Foladare, Irving S. 1968. "The Effect of Neighborhood on Voting Behavior," Political Science Quarterly, vol. 83, no. 4 (December), pp. 516-529.
- Frey, Frederick W. 1970. "Cross-Cultural Survey Research in Political Science," in Robert T. Holt and John E. Turner (eds.), The Methodology of Comparative Research. New York: Free Press, pp. 173-294.
- Frey, Frederick W., and Leslie L. Roos. 1967. Social Structure and Community Development in Rural Turkey: Village and Elite Leadership Relations. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Center for International Studies, Rural Development Research Project, Report No. 10.
- Fried, Marc, and Peggy Gleicher. 1970. "Some Sources of Residential Satisfaction in an Urban Slum," in Robert Gutman and David Popenoe (eds.), Neighborhood, City, and Metropolis. New York: Random House, pp. 730-745.
- Frolic, B. Michael. 1970. "The Soviet Study of Soviet Cities," Journal of Politics, vol. 32, no. 3 (August), pp. 675-695.
- Fromm, Erich, and Michael Maccoby. 1970. Social Character in a Mexican Village. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1961a. "Planning and Social Life: Friendship and Neighbor Relations in Sub-Communities," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, vol. 27, pp. 134-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1961b. The Effect of a Community Upon Its Residents: Some Considerations for Sociological Theory and Planning Policies (paper presented to the American Sociological Association, St. Louis, September).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. The Urban Villagers. New York: Free Press.
- Giusti, Jorge. 1971. "Organizational Characteristics of the Latin American Urban Marginal Settler," International Journal of Politics, vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring), pp. 54-89.
- Goldrich, Daniel M. 1965. "Toward the Comparative Study of Politicization in Latin America," in Dwight Heath and Richard N. Adams (eds.), Contemporary Cultures and Civilizations of Latin America. New York: Random House, pp. 361-377.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970b. "Political Organization and the Politicization of the Poblador," Comparative Political Studies, vol. 3, no. 2 (July), pp. 176-202.

- Goldrich, Daniel, Raymond B. Pratt, and C. R. Schuller. 1970a. "The Political Integration of Lower-Class Urban Settlements in Chile and Peru," in Irving L. Horowitz (ed.), Masses in Latin America. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 175-214.
- Greer, Scott. 1956. "Urbanism Reconsidered: A Comparative Study of Local Areas in a Metropolis," American Sociological Review, vol. 21 (February), pp. 19-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. "The Social Structure and Political Process of Suburbia," in Robert Gutman and David Popenoe (eds.), Neighborhood, City, and Metropolis. New York: Random House, pp. 600-616.
- Greer, Scott, and Peter Orleans. 1962. "The Mass Society and the Parapolitical Structure," American Sociological Review, vol. 27, pp. 634-646.
- Harris, Walter D. 1971. The Growth of Latin American Cities. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press.
- Hauser, Robert M. 1970. "Context and Consequence: A Cautionary Tale," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 75, no. 4, part 2 (January), pp. 645-664.
- Himmelstrand, Ulf. 1960. Social Pressures, Attitudes and Democratic Processes. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Hunter, David R. 1968. The Slums: Challenge and Response. 2nd edition. New York: Free Press.
- Jacob, Phillip et al. 1972. Values and the Active Community. New York: Free Press.
- Johnston, R. J. 1972. Urban Residential Patterns. New York: Praeger.
- Juppenlatz, Morris. 1970. Cities in Transformation: The Urban Squatter Problem of the Developing World. Queensland, Australia: University of Queensland Press.
- Katz, Daniel and Samuel J. Eldersveld. 1961. "The Impact of Local Party Activity Upon the Electorate," Public Opinion Quarterly, vol. 25, pp. 12-15ff.
- Keller, Suzanne. 1968. The Urban Neighborhood. New York: Random House.
- Kendall, Patricia L., and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. 1950. "Problems of Survey Analysis," in Robert K. Merton and P. F. Lazarsfeld (eds.), Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of 'The American Soldier'. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1955. "The Relation Between Individual and Group Characteristics in 'The American Soldier'," in Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (eds.), The Language of Social Research. New York: Free Press, pp. 290-296.

- Kotler, Milton. 1969. Neighborhood Government: The Local Foundations of Political Life. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. The Neighborhood Government Movement (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September).
- Lane, Robert E. 1959. Political Life. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Langton, Kenneth P., and David A. Karns. 1971. Political Socialization and National Development: Some Hypotheses and Data (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, September).
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Herbert Menzel. 1961. "On the Relation Between Individual and Collective Properties," in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 422-440.
- Leeds, Anthony. 1969. "The Significant Variables Determining the Character of Squatter Settlements," América Latina (Rio de Janeiro), vol. 12, no. 3 (July-September), pp. 44-86.
- Levin, Martin L. 1961. "Social Climates and Political Socialization," Public Opinion Quarterly, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 596-606.
- Lewis, Oscar. 1961. The Children of Sánchez: Autobiography of a Mexican Family. New York: Random House.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1964. "The Biography of A Research Project: Union Democracy," in Phillip E. Hammond (ed.), Sociologists at Work. New York: Basic Books, pp. 96-120.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, Martin A. Trow, and James S. Coleman. 1956. Union Democracy. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Lipsky, Michael. 1970. Protest in City Politics. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Litwak, Eugene. 1970. "Voluntary Associations and Neighborhood Cohesion," in Robert Gutman and David Popenoe (eds.), Neighborhood, City, and Metro-  
polis. New York: Random House, pp. 583-600.
- Lutz, Thomas M. 1967. Some Aspects of Community Organization and Activity in the Squatter Settlements of Panama City (unpublished paper, Georgetown University, mimeographed).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. Self-help Neighborhood Organizations, Political Socialization, and the Developing Political Orientations of Urban Squatters in Latin America: Contrasting Patterns from Case Studies in Panama City, Guayaquil, and Lima (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University).
- MacEwen, Allison M. 1971. "Marginalidad y movilidad en una villa miseria," Revista Latinoamericana de Sociología, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 37-53.

- McKenney, James W. 1969. Voluntary Associations and Political Integration: An Exploratory Study of the Role of Voluntary Association Membership in the Political Socialization of Urban Lower Class Residents of Santiago, Chile, and Lima, Peru (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon).
- McKenzie, Roderick Duncan. 1972. "The Neighborhood," in Robert K. Yin (ed.), The City in the Seventies. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock Publishers, pp. 42-44.
- Mangin, William. 1967. "Latin American Squatter Settlements: A Problem and a Solution," Latin American Research Review, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 65-98.
- Mann, Peter H. 1970. "The Neighborhood," in Robert Gutman and David Popenoe (eds.), Neighborhood, City, and Metropolis. New York: Random House, pp. 568-583.
- Marshall, Dale. 1968. "Who Participates in What: A Bibliographic Essay on Individual Participation in Urban Areas," Urban Affairs Quarterly, vol. 4 (December), pp. 201-224.
- Mercado Villar, Olga, et al. 1970. La Marginalidad urbana: origen, proceso, y modo. Buenos Aires and Santiago de Chile: DESAL-Ediciones Troquel.
- Michelson, William. 1966. Value Orientations and the Urban Physical Environment: An Empirical Assessment (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, Philadelphia).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. Man and His Urban Environment: A Sociological Approach. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Miller, Warren E. 1956. "One Party Politics and the Voter," American Political Science Review, vol. 50 (September), pp. 707-725.
- Morse, Richard M. 1965. "Recent Research on Latin American Urbanization: A Selective Survey with Commentary," Latin American Research Review, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 35-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971. "Trends and Issues in Latin American Urban Research, 1965-1970 (Part II)," Latin American Research Review, vol. 6, no. 2 (Summer), pp. 19-76.
- Nasatir, David. 1968. "A Note on Contextual Effects and the Political Orientation of University Students," American Sociological Review, vol. 33, no. 2 (April), pp. 210-219.
- Orbell, John M. 1970. "The Impact of Metropolitan Residence on Social and Political Orientations," Social Science Quarterly, vol. 51, no. 3 (December), pp. 634-648.
- Orbell, John M. and Kenneth S. Sherrill. 1969. "Racial Attitudes and the Metropolitan Context: A Structural Analysis," Public Opinion Quarterly vol. 33, no. 1 (Spring), pp. 46-54.

- Orbell, John M., and Toru Uno. 1972. "A Theory of Neighborhood Problem-Solving: Political Action vs. Residential Mobility," American Political Science Review, vol. 66, no. 2 (June), pp. 471-489.
- Park, Robert E. 1952. Human Communities. New York.
- Peattie, Lisa Redfield. 1968. The View from the Barrio. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.
- Perlman, Janice E. 1971. The Fate of Migrants in Rio's Favelas (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
- Petras, James F. 1972. Workers in Chile (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., September).
- Pizzorno, Alessandro. 1970. "An Introduction to the Theory of Political Participation," Social Science Information, vol. 9 (October), pp. 29-61.
- Portes, Alejandro. 1970. Radicalism in the Slum: A Study of Political Attitudes in Chilean Lower Class Settlements (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971a. "The Urban Slum in Chile: Types and Correlates," Land Economics, vol. 47, no. 3 (August), pp. 235-248.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971b. "Political Primitivism, Differential Socialization, and Lower Class Leftist Radicalism," American Sociological Review, vol. 36, no. 5 (October), pp. 820-835.
- Powell, Sandra. 1969. "Political Participation in the Barriadas: A Case Study," Comparative Political Studies, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 195-215.
- Pratt, Raymond B. 1971a. "Community Political Organizations and Lower Class Politization in Two Latin American Cities," Journal of Developing Areas, vol. 5 (July), pp. 523-542.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971b. "Parties, Neighborhood Associations, and the Politicization of the Urban Poor in Latin America," Midwest Journal of Political Science, vol. 15, no. 3 (August), pp. 495-524.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1966. "Political Attitudes and the Local Community," American Political Science Review, vol. 60, no. 3 (September), pp. 640-654.
- Ray, Talton F. 1969. The Politics of the Barrios of Venezuela. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Roberts, Bryan. 1970a. "The Social Organization of Low-Income Families," in Irving L. Horowitz (ed.), Masses in Latin America. New York and London: Oxford University Press, pp. 345-382.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970b. "Urban Poverty and Political Behavior in Guatemala," Human Organization, vol. 29, no. 1 (Spring), pp. 20-28.

- Robson, B. T. 1969. Urban Analysis. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodríguez, Alfredo, Gustavo Riofrío, Eileen Welsh. 1972. "De Invasores a invadidos," Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbano-Regionales, vol. 2, No. 4 (March), pp. 101-142.
- Rogler, Lloyd. 1967. "Slum Neighborhoods in Latin America," Journal of Inter-American Studies, vol. 9 (October), pp. 507-528.
- Rokkan, Stein. 1955. "Party Preferences and Opinion Patterns in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis," International Social Science Bulletin, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 575-596.
- Ross, H. Laurence. 1970. "The Local Community: A Survey Approach," in Robert Gutman and David Popenoe (eds.), Neighborhood, City, and Metropolis. New York: Random House, pp. 557-568.
- Scheuch, Erwin K. 1969. "Social Context and Individual Behavior," in Mattei Dogan and Stein Rokkan (eds.), Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp. 133-155.
- Schorr, Alvin L. 1970. "Housing and its Effects," in Robert Gutman and David Popenoe (eds.), Neighborhood, City and Metropolis. New York: Random House, pp. 709-725.
- Segal, David R., and Marshall W. Meyer. 1969. "The Social Context of Political Partisanship," in Mattei Dogan and Stein Rokkan (eds.), Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, pp. 217-232.
- Sewell, William H., and J. Michael Armer. 1966. "Neighborhood Context and College Plans," American Sociological Review, vol. 31, no. 2 (April), pp. 159-168.
- Sherif, Muzafer, and Carolyn W. Sherif. 1964. Reference Groups. New York: Harper and Row.
- Stokes, Charles J. 1962. "A Theory of Slums," Land Economics, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 187-197.
- Stouffer, Samuel A., et al. 1949. The American Soldier. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Suttles, Gerald D. 1968. The Social Order of the Slum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tannenbaum, Arnold S., and Jerald G. Bachman. 1964. "Structural Versus Individual Effects," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 69, no. 6 (May), pp. 585-595.

- Timms, Duncan. 1971. The Urban Mosaic: Towards a Theory of Residential Differentiation. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomeh, Aida K. 1969. "Empirical Considerations in the Problem of Social Integration," Sociological Inquiry, vol. 39, pp. 65-76.
- Vanderschueren, Franz. 1971a. "Significado político de las juntas de vecinos en poblaciones de Santiago," Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbano-Regionales, vol. 1, no. 2 (June), pp. 67-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971b. "Pobladores y conciencia social," Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Urbano-Regionales, vol. 1, no. 3 (October), pp. 95-123.
- Verba, Sidney. 1969. "The Uses of Survey Research in the Study of Comparative Politics," in Stein Rokkan et al., Comparative Survey Analysis. The Hague: Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971a. "Cross-National Survey Research: The Problem of Credibility," in Ivan Vallier (ed.), Comparative Methodology in Sociology. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Verba, Sidney, et al. 1971b. Caste, Race, and Politics: A Comparative Study of India and the United States. Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Verba, Sidney, Norman H. Nie, and Jae-On Kim. 1971c. "The Modes of Democratic Participation: A Cross-National Comparison," Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Politics, vol. 2, no. 01-013, pp. 1-80.
- Verba, Sidney, and Norman H. Nie. 1972. Participation in America. New York: Harper and Row.
- Wilson, Robert A. 1971a. "Anomia and Militancy Among Urban Negroes: A Study of Neighborhood and Individual Effects," The Sociological Quarterly, vol. 12 (Summer), pp. 369-386.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1971b. "Anomie in the Ghetto: A Study of Neighborhood Type, Race, and Anomie," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 77, no. 1 (July), pp. 66-88.
- Young, M., and P. Willmott. 1957. Family and Kinship in East London. London.

ADDENDA

- Barton, Allen H., and Robert Hauser. 1970. "Comments on Hauser's 'Context and Consex'; Rejoinder," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 76, no. 3 (November), pp. 514-520.

- Dogan, Mattei, and Stein Rokkan (eds.). 1969. Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Nie, Norman, Dale H. Bent, and C. Hadlai Hull. 1970. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Turner, John F. C. 1971. The Squatter Revolution: Autonomous Urban Settlement and Social Change in Transitional Economies (unpublished manuscript, Department of Urban Studies and City Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).